

# BABEL no BETHEL.

That is,

The Church of *Rome* no true visible  
Church of C H R I S T.

In answer to Hugh Cholmley's Challenge, and  
Rob: Butterfields Maschil, two masculine  
Champions for the Synagogue  
of *Rome*.

By H. B. Rector of St. Matthews Friday-street.

## JUDGES. 6. 31.

W<sup>t</sup> yee plead for Baal? Will yee save him? If hee be a God,  
let him plead for himselfe, because one hath cast downe his  
Altar.

Tertullian: adversus Hermogenem, liber.

Hermogenes loquacitatem, facundiam existimat: Et impudem-  
tiam, constantiam deputat: Et maledicere, officium bona  
conscientie judicat? Sed viderit persona, cum doctrina  
nisi quaesiret.

Bernard. Epist. 190. de Abailardo.

... non iustius os loquens talia sustinet, quæ  
rationibus refelleretur?

Aug. contra Julianum Pelagianum,

... non ipsum calamo nisi sacramentum erubescendo converte-  
retur in minimum?



Printed for M. S. 1629.

БАБЕЛОНІЯ

ПЕРСІЯ

Індія

Ізраїль

69:04

ప్రాణాన్తమయితే ప్రాణాన్తమయితే ప్రాణాన్తమయితే ప్రాణాన్తమయితే

To be High and Honourable Court  
of Parliament now by Gods mercy assem-  
bled, the Spirit of wisdom and vnder-  
standing, the Spirit of counsell and concient,  
the spirit of zeale & courage for CHRIST  
and his Truth be multiplyed.



Off Sacred Senate,  
Sith it hath pleased  
God of his mercy to  
re-assemble, you in  
these deplored times,  
as a great Colledge of  
wise Physicians, to con-  
sult how our corrupti-  
ons may bee cuted:  
what cause haue we all

to lesse his Name, and to pray for his blessing vpon  
ycherein? Nor may we forget to giue him thanks  
foyour last meeting, wherein God put into the  
het of our gracious King to put to his Spetiall  
hod to the healing of an importāt symptome. Now  
although it be a rule of the Physicians, that the invir-  
ing of the method in healing doth often resemble  
a disease: yet they agree, that sometimes a Symp-  
tome requires present remedy, before the disease be-  
edled with. This your wildomes observing, you

*The Epistle Dedicatory.*

happily began with the Symptome ; and now re-  
maines the maine disease to bee cured, which is, the  
State of Religion. And Religion being the Soule,  
And the Republicke the Body, the Soules distemper  
(wee hope) will the more easily be cured, after the  
disordered humours of the body are rectified, and  
the predominant peccant purged ; the Soule follow-  
ing the temperature of the body, as saith the Philo-  
sopher. Nor need your religious wisedomes to take  
your rules elsewhere, eyther for the necessity, or due  
manner of reforming religion, then from Godsword.

Yet it is the obseruation euен of the Politia him-

*Macbeth. Dis-  
pus. lib. 1. esp.* selfe, that whatsoeuer Princes and Common-wealthes  
desire to preserue themselues, they must afer all

12. "things haue a speciall care of the well ordering of  
"true Religion; nor canst thou haue (saith he) an ore  
"certaine signe of the ruine of Religion, then when  
"thou seest Gods worship despised and contemned;  
"therfore such must be cheefly carefull, that theoun-  
"dations of religion be kept safe and sound in good  
"reparation, if they would haue theyr citizes or  
"subiects well affected and inclined to imbr<sup>ace</sup> can-  
"cord. And if this so diligent care of Gods w<sup>m</sup> sp  
"had beene obserued of christian Magistrates (aith  
"he) according to the first diuine institution wee  
"should haue injoyed farre greater happiness and  
"peace in the Christian world, So he. And wh<sup>e</sup> did  
the state of Religion in our land cry lowder for re-  
purgation, then now ? The babylonish aduersaries  
were never more insolent; more confident. And by  
not ? Haue they not found Aduocates enoug in  
our Church to plead their cause ? Witnesse v<sup>e</sup>  
Pamphlets lately published with priuilege, thene

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

by Hugh Cholmley, the other by Robert Butterfield. Such base booke, written by professed Protestant Ministers, and that, of the Church of England, no age euer produced, much lesse patronized in this our State, since the reformation of our Religion established, till within the memory of Children of 7. yeares, in which space what booke haue domineered and revelled among vs, but such as maintaine cyther the Arminian heresie, or the Antichristian Apostacie? Besides the abundance of Popish booke transported hither from beyond the Seas, to the infinite damage of simple chapmen, which are bought and sould without checke or controule.

Now for the Arminian heresie, none was euer more damnable, none more repugnant to the grace of the Gospell, directly vndermining and ouerturning Gods eternall free grace in electing and predestinating vs vnto saluation, as also the powerfull worke of his grace in our effectuall vocation and conuersion, and persecutance therein vnto glory. Which damnable heresies ere now had been beaten to dust, or pressed to death, if the presses might haue had faire play. In the meane time the fautors and authors of them goe prettily on, to keepe their heresies on foot. For at this present there is a profest Arminian booke already printed, hauing lyen a pretty while in the decke, not daring as yet to come abroad, which the feare of some Palliament-storm, like a spring frost keepest backe from putting forth the leaues. So little hope is there of the curing of this creeping gangrene, or fretting Cancer, if this Sacred Senate take not the surer order to prevent their overspreading of the most noble Church and State in the world.

For the Antichristian Apostacie, the Romish Synagogue is maiotained tooth and nayle to be a true visible

### The Epistle Dedicatore.

Church. Which if it were by Jesuites we should not  
meraile: but the mischiefe is, it is by our own protest Mi-  
nisters. And it should seem (I craue pardon, if I mistake)  
as though there were some secret plott, which all the  
world knowes not, for the reducing either of Popery in-  
to *England*, or *England* to Popery, or at least reconciling  
vs together vpon some indifferent termes. For Mr. Cholm-  
ley hath intimated so much in his Epistle Dedicatore to  
his reverend Diocesan, where speaking reproachfully of  
me (as his constant manner is throughout his booke) for  
writing so against the Church of Rome, he saith, *He hath*  
*not only shamed himself, but put vs all out of order, hindered*  
*our good proceedings &c.* But what hee meaneth by his  
*order, and good proceedings*, I leaue to the judiciale ex-  
amination of your wisedomes.

And the suspition is the stronger as being nourished  
by a continuall current, that so mettily drives the Po-  
pish mills about, and sets ours in a back water or float.  
Being therefore prouoked, not only by the cause it selfe,  
so full of moment, and for the sauing of poore simple  
soules, easily either tolled into Romes Net, or the faster  
intangled in their hunters toyle, who soever graze with-  
in that pale: but also by way of challenge from these  
champions for Babel: I haue in this small Treatise (wor-  
thy of a farre abler pen) fully cleared (I hope) and evi-  
dently concluded the vniuersall Romish Synagogue to  
be no true visible Church of Christ, but the Apostate  
Synagogue of Satan and Antichrist, wherin by the es-  
tablished doctrine and faith thereof, no saluation is to be  
sonnd, and therefore ought to be abandoned of all, that  
seeke for saluation by Christ. I haue among other vna-  
swerable Arguments, together with the remouall of all  
the maine obiections to the contrary, clearly prooued,  
that

## The Epistle Dedicatore.

hat the Papall Synagogue hath no true and lawfull ordination, or Ministeriall Calling, according to Christ's institution, so as all their sacrificizing shaueling Priests, are but a rabble of Antichrists Factors and Vsurpers, a company of soule-cheaters, heauen-robbbers, quacksalvers, and mountebanks, purse-pickers, and imposters, state-treachers, troublers, and betrayers, meere prophangers and destroyers of the sacred calling.

Wherefore my humble suite in the name of Iesus Christ, to this Sacred Senate is, that there may not be left one Idolatrous Massle-monger or Iesuite in this Church, Court, or Country. Thus should all Popish Idols fall to ground, having neuer a shauē sacrificer left to support them, or by such puppit Idols to supplant their blind adorers to their eternall destruction. And consider yee graue sages, what a horrible sinne it is to suffer any one Idol wittingly & willingly to be exalted against Christ in this our Israel. Is it not a high dishonour to God, a prouocation of his jealousie against this whole Land? Hauie we prospered in any enterprize, since we haue permitted Romes Gods to roost among vs? And can wee expect better, but euē to bee vtterly consumed, and rooted out, if they be not paſt away the sooner? Againe, what a fearefull sinne is it for vs to become voluntary Accessories to others damnation? And are we not so, while we suffer popish Idolaters, euē vnder our noses, and roofes, to perish in their damnable Idolatries? For what Protestant, yea or they that thus plead for Roue, but confesse, that an Idolatrous Papist, without Repentance, cannot be saved? If so, why do we suffer them to liue and dye in their Idolatry? Or is it not Idolatry? Will any man now make question of it, for which so many holy Martyrs of Christ lost their liues? Or hath

### The Epistle Dedicatory.

hath it been so formerly, & is it not so now? Is it any whit refined? Is it not as grosse and damnable now as euer it was? Or was euer Heathen Idolatry so grosse as it? For Gods sake therefore, joyne hearts and hands to the purging of the Court, Citie, Countrie, and euery corner of the Land of all popish Priests and Idols. Let not a rag of Romish trumperie be left, to seperate vs from our God, to the infatuating of our Countels, the cowardizing of our English spirits, the ruining of our State, and Religion, and the betraying of our selues and the neighbouring Churches, ( while we prove to be the Egyptian Reed, which hurteth not, vnlesse leaned vpon, or trusted vnto ) to become a prey to the Romish Dragon, or Spanish Eagle. And our Church and State thus puged, be the Soueraigne head of this Senate intreated by the whole body, for a publike weekly fast & humiliation for the revving of our Covenant with God, never to be broken againe. For certeinly great is the wrath that is gone out against this Land. We haue hitherto but playd the Hypocrites in our Fastes, while our abominable & crying sins, Romish Idols, Iesuites and Priests, and other abominations are still with vs vn-castout. And you know, that such were the sinnes of *Manasseh* ( who filled Ierusalem with innocent bloud, and Idols ) as howsoeuer himselfe vpon his true humiliation was received to mercy, yet neither his reformation, nor *Ezechias* purgation of religion after him, were of force to recover Gods fauor or to preuent the Babylonian captiuitie; so indeble is the staine of innocent bloud, shed, or betrayed, whether of the bodies of Gods people by cruell treacherie, or of their soules by crooked Idolatry. Yet, as *Ezechias* said, *let there be peace in my dayes*; so let vs pray for the peace of our Ierusalem, labouring to establish it,

*The Epistle Dedicatorye.*

as good King Ezechias, Asa, and Iosias did, by reforming and repurging Religion. So may we recover our strength, and prosper, and regaine our English credit, now shamefully trampled vnder our enemies insulting foot. But till wee haue done thus, never let vs looke to prosper, but to be made the *tayle*, and not the *head*. Yea can the Church of England looke backe to Sodome, and not bee turned into a pillar of Salt, senselesse in it selfe, but easie to the beholders? Remember Lots wife. Or if Amasiah, silence Amos in *Besbhel*, can hee with Idolatrous Israell expect any other, but desolation? And are not the Heavens astonisched to behold the stupor of such, as should cry out against *Bethels Altar*? What's the reason? Surely an Idol (as the Romish Dagon) is like the fish *Torpedo*, which but touched with the end of a flasse, stupifeth him that holds it. *Wee* cannot behold Romes Idols with the least assent, or silent conniuerce, but *wee* are made like to the Idol it selfe, hauing *Eyes and see not, mouths, and speake not..* This was that, for which the Lord called the Prophets *dumbe dogs*, and *Idoll Shepbeards*.

But did not *SALOMON* the wisest King tolerate Idolatrie in the skirts of his Court? True. But was this a point of his wisedome? Yea, was it not the Deuils policie by this meanes to bring that glorious Kingdome (as all others) to ruine? What got *SALOMON* at length? Was not his peaceable Kingdome for this very cause pusht at by three potent enemies at once? Was not *SALOMON* faine to come home againe by weeping Croffe? And left hee not a Sonne, borne of an Ammonitish woman, who

The Epistle Dedicatory.

by his inflexibilitie, animated by his younger Counsellers (so hastening the doome vpon his fathers sinne, and his owne, treading in his steps) lost, irrecoverably tenne parts of his Kingdome at a clap? And what Christian kingdomes, following such steps, but may justly expect the like fatall issue? And if any other, wee most of all, liuing so long vnder the very me-ridian of the Gospell.

Againe, bee this Sacred Senate humbly intreated, that a more strict and effectuall order may bee ta-ken, for the repressing of such lawlesse libertie in the publishing &c such base booke, as now haue filled our Church with schismes, and our Land with factions; such as necessarily exclude the orthodox booke, from hauing priuiledge for the Presse; for how should the Licensers bee *ambit dexteris*? To whom wee can but offer our booke and bee denied license: it being familiar to deny those booke's li-cense, which (as they alledge) touch vpon Contro-versies, and crosse theyr owne opinions, while the Ar-minian and Popish defendants passe currant. And that for very shame, the Truth may not bee suppressed or silenced for Heresie sake; as once the Arrianis desired of **C O N S T A N T I V S** the suppressing of the mention of *Homonios*, which suppression the Orthodox Bishops protested against: or as the Arminian Remonstrants of late obtained of theyr Magistrates against the true Protestant Ministers in the *Low Countries*. God forbid, wee should thus skin ouer the festered sore; or to di-uide the true mothers liuing child with her, that had ouer-laid her owne; or tye the liuing man face to face to the dead: or with **B A L A C K**, when hee could

*The Epistle Dedicatory.*

could not preuaile by cursing, to bid B A L A A M ney-  
ther blesse nor curse, which not euен the couetous  
Prophet would or durst obey, but went on to blesse  
Gods people. And God forbid our Prophets should  
proue worse then B A L A A M. But the word of God is  
not bound. And rather then it should bee bound, or  
muzzled, if all the band-dog heresies of hell were let  
loose, to fight it out; wee should bee sure that Truth  
at length would put all her gaine-sayers to silence; who  
otherwise will easilie preuaile.

And now most noble Senate, if in a stormy and rocky  
Sea, I haue so farre aduentured my boat to rescue from  
wracke many ignorant Passengers, (who might perish,  
without wafting to the right Port) as in the meane time  
I proue like *Jonas*, cast into the sea for the safetie of the  
Ship: Yet my trust is, that my God will prouide a  
Whale, or a Graue, wherein I shall not see this goodly  
Church and State vndermined by a Crew of Romish  
Pioners. Thus casting my selfe at the feete of this Sa-  
cred Senate, humbly crauing pardon for my boldnesse,  
and praying God to make this the most happie Parlia-  
ment, that eueryet was in England, I rest

*The most humble servant  
of this most Hon: Senate.*

H E N R Y B U R T O N.

2002-08-28: H. sp. in 10

HISTORICAL



To the right Reuerend Father  
in God, the Lord Bishop of  
Exon.

Right Reuerend,



Being prouoked and assaülted by two An-  
tagonists, who out of some strange zeale,  
(whether against the cause I propugne, or  
towards your Lordshp I judge not) haue  
heated the furnace of their indignation  
seven times hotter then ordinary to force  
me bow to the Image of their exalted imagination: I thought  
it my duty, before I enter the lists, to addresse my selfe to  
your Lordship, not fearing to choose your selfe for Vmpire,  
whom they haue so deeply engaged (as I suppose they thinke)  
in their quarrell. Not that I take aduantage of the offence  
they haue iustly given you in the fowle carriage of the cause, if  
equally and vnpartially weighed: but chieflie trusting to your  
ingenuity and integrarie of judgement, when once you haue  
heard both parties. But first let me craue pardon of your LoP:  
in case (in a cause so important, as I conceiue) any one drop  
(in the pouring out of those Vials) hath distilled from my  
pen, which might (for the more praise sake) deserue the  
spunge. Homo sum, humani a me nil alienum puto.  
This is the comfort of my conscience, that the thing I mainly  
aimed at, was Gods glory, the honor of our Mother Churcb,  
and the saluation of simple and vnsable soules, who are the  
more easily either tolled on board, or retained vnder hatches  
in Peters shipp (as they falsly call it) therein to run a desperase  
bazard of inevitable shipwracke, wher they haue the warranty  
of some of our owne Pilots to per swade them, that they ride  
Peters shipp, where in they may safely arriuue at the holy Land.  
And that I speake not at Randome, witnessse a Recusant of

late, with whō a Minister of London being called to confer (& he told it me himselfe) the Recusant at first dash will d' him set his heart at rest, for (qd. hee) the best in your Church confesse ours a true Church, wherin saluation is to be found; which we deny to your Church, and therefore we are on the surer side.

Pag. 25.

But I hope your Lordship's owne words in your Reconciler, will a little qualifie and abate such insolence ( though Papists are apt enough to reply, Thy brother Benhadab) where you say, They are of the visible Church, such as it is; what is this, but to say, they are neyther Iewes, nor Turkes, nor Pagans, but misbeleuuers damnable hereticall in opinion, shamefullly Idolatrous in practise. Yes let your Lordships owne inference upon Zanchies Asernes of a true visible Church of Christ ( answere by all Protestants ) forever stop Recusants mouthes, and dash Protestants pens or pen-cells, for ever after painting the strumpet with the natiue colours of the true spouse; to wit, If we bring the Romane Church to this touch. ( pag. 15.) Shee is cast for a mere counterfeit; shee is as farre from truth, as truth is from falsehood. So your Lordship in fine, if your Episcopall care can dispense with the pernall of this poore Labour of mine, I trust you shall find, that I haue followed your truely Episcopall counsell in your Reconciler, by turning my sword into a sick, to cut downe the ranke of their corruption of the Romish Synagogue, and any speare into a malocke, to dig downe the walls of great Babylon, so as, I trust your Lordship and all men shall see the fall of this controversie, lying buried in Babels ruinous heape, whence I hope none will offer to rake it out, and let it on foote againe. Thus craving pardon for my boldnesse, and humbly taking leaue of your Lop. I rest, deprecating the name of an aduersarie, but desiring to performe to your Lordship all offices, in the power of

Your Lordships poore younger brother,  
and Servant in Christ.

HENRY BRYTON.

To Mr. HUGH CHOLMLEY, Rector of the  
Portion of Clare, in the Parish of Tyverton in Devon:  
H.B. Rector of St. Mathews Friday street London,  
wisheth more sound Knowledge, more sin-  
cere loue of the Truth, more zeale  
for CHRIST, and lesse for  
Antichrist.



After CHOLMLEY, when I read your  
Epistle to mee, and then your Booke,  
what a disparicie I found? In the one  
me thought I heard the mild voyce of  
Jacob, but in the other, I am sure I felt  
the rough hands of Esau. So that I  
began to muse, whether you were a Jacob counterfeiting  
Esau, or rather an Esau counterfeiting Jacob. Whether-  
soever, thinke you by this meanes to procure your Mo-  
thers blessing, as He his Fathers? But that which made  
mee most to muse, was, how it was possible, that such  
a one, as Mr. Cholmley, should write such a booke, whe-  
ther wee consider the matter or the style. For the style,  
or language of it, I tooke it to bee some Iesuites, some  
Eudemon's, or Cacodæmon's, or the like: and that it  
was not possible for an Israelite to plow with so sharpe a  
share, vntlesse hee had borrowed a Philistins scle. And  
for the matter, I wondred as much, how it was pos-  
sible for an ancient, painefull, laborious Minister of  
the Church of England, every way equall (at least) in  
his Ministeriall labours and studies (as you say of your  
selfe) to Henry Burton, to take vp the bucklar in such  
a quarrell. Surely if you had not told vs what

a painfull Minister you are ; I confesse I should haue taken you for one that perhaps formerly had bene paine-  
full and industrious in your Ministerie, but falling from that to easie, from a Bee to a Dioane, from a weekeley preaching to a monethly Sermon, and so, from your first loue ; God had hereupon taken your graces from you, and giuen you up to squander away the remenant of your reason and judgement, and other naturall parts in so shamefull a cause, as instead of being a builder of Sion, to become a cobler vp of the wast ruines of forlorne Ba-  
bylon. But you doe it to vindicate the cause of your reuerend Diocesan. I am sorry you should instead thereof so much dishonour him. For in stead of vindicating him, who denieth the Church of Rome to be an Orthodo<sup>x</sup> or true belieuing Church ; you, forgetting your selfe, and him too, fall to vindicate the Church of Rome, and to proue it to be an Orthodo<sup>x</sup> Church. So that what you haue affirmed of the Church of Rome in defence of the Councell of Trent all along ; the Reader will be ready to take all your assertions for your reuerend Diocesans. Wherein what fouler aspersion can result vpon his reuerend person ? But in the first front of your Epistle Dedicatori<sup>c</sup> you disclaime pleading for Baal, or for Babel, and you say, *Les Babel pleade for her selfe.* But your practise altogether crossing your pretence, proues the Proverbe true, *Fronti nulla fides.* Wherein you doe as I haue read of a corrupt Judge, whose fashion was, when hee had a purpose to helpe out a man in his bad cause, to fall oule vpon him with sharpe language, which was but an Item to his Client to lay the heauyer fee in his lighter scale. Neyther doe I belieue the report to be true, that you are already rewarded with a Prebend for this your good seruice. But if you had fit still, and

Epistle.

let Babel plead for her selfe, you might haue deserued more thankes, and that I dare say, from your reverend Diocesan.

But tell me, I pray you, how you came so easily to get your Plea for Babel licensed for the Preffe. *Ab initio non fuit sic.* Surely if *Philoxenus* the Poet had beene the Examiner, he would haue done with yours, as hee did with the Tragedie, which *Dionisius* sent to him for his approbation, who sent it backe to him scored and cancelled quite through, as being all naught. *Vna Litura post.* And whereas you call it an vnworthy *Defence* of seaven dayes, *Apelles* might answer you, as hee did the brag-painter, when he shewed him his goodly picture of a dayes painting, *I thought no lesse*, quoth *Apelles*. And for ought I know, you may spend Seuen yeares in such a defence, and be never the nearer, for all you call mee a Braggadochio. And when I saw in what little request your and Mr. *Batterfield*s booke were, and that worthily, I could not easily resolute to thinke them worthy of an answer. Yet seeing the cause to be very important and being challenged by you, I resolued to answer you, obseruing the Counsell of *Solomon*, *Pron. 26. 4. 5.* I haue answered you, that you should not applaud your selfe in your opinion: and so answered, as I might not be like unto you. For I passe by all your Contemptuous and reproachfull language, as imputing it, to a *καρογναία*, necessarily attending that pen, that vndertakes the defence of such a cause. So that I might compare your writing, as *Tertullian* doth *Heretikes*, to the *Sepiae*, a kind of Fish, who least they bee taken of theyr pursuers, cast behind them abundance of blacke matter, and so escape out of sight. But it may please God to give you repentance for such a soule worke as this, so full of blacke matter; that

Epistle.

so deposito animositate contradicendi, que tamen omnes,  
qui veritate Dei vincunt nolunt, & sua peruersitate vincun-  
tur, As August. speakes, you may acquit your selfe for a  
good Christian. And remember, Master Cholmley, you  
haue past your solemne word to me, for your words  
are, If you can (say you) soundly and substantiallye conuince  
me of untruthe, I profess before God and the world, that I  
will yeeld unto you, without any more adoe; being already  
willing to be ouercome of the truth in this cause (they bee  
your owne words) and thereupon I claime your pro-  
mise, hauing not disclaimed the match on this conditi-  
on, vpon so good witnesses, as God and the world. And  
I hope you haue not vttered this protestation, on the  
outside of a presumption of the goodnessse of your  
cause, and the strength of your art and wit in handling  
it, and on the other, out of a preiudicate opinion of  
the weakenesse of your Aduersary. You know, that  
the very contempt of an Aduersary, and presumption  
of a Captaines owne forces, hath lost him the field.

And it is not without cause, if I thus doubt, for you  
call all my Arguments *weake cauills*, and all your booke  
through you load me with vilifications extreamly. Now  
thus doing, you shall either abate the glory of your  
Etorie, or expose your selfe to the greater hazards of  
disgrace, if ouercome. Or if you presumed my reply  
would not find a passe, and so you might fight the more  
securely without an Aduersary: you know that truth  
seekes no corners, nor will easilly be baffled; and besides,  
hauing to deale (if it be true as you say) with a man of  
a contentious humour, you might well suspect the  
worst.

But before I enter the lists with you, I pray you re-  
solute me of one thing in your Dedication, where you  
say

Epistle.

say, that in handling of this argument of the Church of Rome, I haue not onely shamed my selfe, but (say you) put vs all out of order, hindered our good proceedings, &c. What meant you by *Vs* all? what, by putting *us* all out of order? or what bee those good proceedings of yours, which I haue hindered? These speeches are to me Paradoxes, and Riddles. I hope there is no such order, or good proceedings afoot among *all you*, of whom ye speake as to re-erect and establish the Romish Baal againe in our land, for which you haue so doughtily pleaded. If that be your meaning, I cry you mercy, then haue I committed a sin of ignorance all this while, in putting you all out of order, and hindring your good proceedings. Pardon me this wrong, and henceforth I will not plead ignorance, but I will both profess my selfe an Adversary against such a faction, and will both by my penne, and with my tongue, and with my heart by earnest prayer to God, labor all I can to put you out of such Order, and to hinder and overturne all such good proceedings. And the Lord assist me more and more, and cheere vp his faithiull seruants cuery where, cuen his called and chosen, and *faithfull*, to maintaine the Lambs quarell against the proud Wolfe, and beast of Babylon.

But doth not your Portion of *Clare* lye now at stake, and you ouer head and eares in a Premunire, for defending a point contrary to the stablished doctrine of the Church of England. Looke vpon the statute, and tremble, and resort as some of your betters haue giuen you a faire example.

What tell I you of your hazard of your portion of *Clare*, when you haue for your part not only imperilled so many poore soules of their portion of heauen,

*The Epistle Dedicatory.*

who are apt to be scandalized by this your defence, but obdured and obfirmed the hearts of Recusants to their further condemnation? You plead for the Church of Rome, and for your Reuerend Diocesan. But how can you so pleade for the one, and yet vindicate the honour of the other? The Lord open your eyes, and giue you grace to behold and bewaile what a just offence you haue giuen by your vnjust defence, which being sudainly done in seuen dayes space, will require seuen yeeres repentance. You must pardon my zeale; it is ( for all your scoffs ; and so you shall find it ) for God, and for his Church. But for particular and personall wrongs you load me withall, I haue laboured to digest such hard morsels with the stomacke of Christian patience, which otherwise to flesh and blood, had not bene very easie to ouercome.

*Your brother in Christ, but  
profest adversary in the cause  
of Antichrist.*

H. B.

H. BVRTON TO MR. ROB: BVTTERFIELD,  
with his more riperesse of yeares, and more  
soundnesse of judgement, before he will no  
dare any more handle such deepe; alioiem  
Controversies.

**M**ister BVTTERFIELD, bee not your  
invenitie insulc, that I answer your  
Latine Elegancie with my English rusti-  
cise. For it would not be a Decorum in  
mee to seeme to contend with you upon  
all termes of parisse or correspon-  
dence: Suffice is mee I haue not disdained to nominate  
you in the quarrell. And though the Proverbe is, Ne  
Hercules contra Duos: yet if there were three score  
of you, in such a cause, I hope, through Gods helpe, I  
might bee bold to cope with you all. I doe in this Booke  
therefore, Vna fidelia duos parietes dealbare, as the  
Proverbe is, white two walls with one brush: the  
substance of the Answere to your Mashil, you may find  
all along in this to Master Cholmley's; wherewith I  
hope both of you will rest satisfied.

Now for your Mashil, the stupendious title of your  
Booke, you would seeme to instruct all the world that  
you are an Hebrician, and that you had some young Pu-  
pils to deale withall. But let mee tell you for your in-  
struction, there is a Mashil, an Hebrew word, writ-

## Epistle.

iv. v. ten with the same letter v, onely differing by a small  
prieker. Now when I consider your youth, and the  
weight of the Argument which you attempt, Impar-  
viribus istis, and your eagernesse with the Printer to  
play the midwifre with all Speed to the bringing forth of  
this your Infans ; and what a dwarfe it is : me thinkes  
you shoule haue named the Child rather Mashchil, then  
Matchil ; Mashchil signifying an abortine, one borne  
before the due time. And for Matchil you might haue  
kept it to your selfe, for your owne private use and bet-  
ter instruction, how to meddle in such high matters.  
But I spare you, onely take heed of building your hopes  
upon such a fandie foundation. And abuse not the good  
guises God hath bestowed vpon you to a base vse.

Farewell.

To the Christian and Judicious

Reader.

**C**hristian and judicious Reader, our late learned Doctor Field in his Epistle Medicatorie before his booke of the Church, saith, That there is no part of heavenly knowledge more necessary, than that which concerneth the Church. And a little after, what is said of his times, I referre to thy judgement, how suitable it may bee for these. The condition (saith he) of the times wherein we live is such, that many are discouraged from mealing with the controversies of religion, because they are sure (besides the vyle flanders, wicked Calumniations, and bitter reproaches of the common aduersaries) to passe the censures of those men, who though they will doe nothing themselves, yet in the bright of a proud and disdainfull spirit, with many a scornefull looke, smile at the follies of other mens writings, as they esteem them. Now if hee, a man of those eminent guylts, so complained of his times: what shall any inferiour Minister, entring the lists of most important controversies in these dayes, expect, but besides scornefull looks, alio vyle flanders, wicked calumniations, and bitter reproaches, and that not of the common aduersaries, as then, but of home bred friends, the Sons of our Mother? Not doe I speake by guesse. I am not the first, though the least by many, that haue written, (but occasionally at first) at first to proue the Church of Rome no true visible Church of Christ: yet such is my hope to fall vpon that age, wherein I am the first, whom in this argument, euern mine owne brethren haue openly and keenly oppugned with fell weapon in hand. And if it were my person onely, which they tosse vpon their

pcns,

To the Christian Reader.

pens, tearing me in peeces with violent and bitter reproches, I could the better brooke it.

But such a cause as this, whereon depends the salvation or damnation of thoufands of soules, I craue pardon if I cannot let it fall to ground. Wherein for my part, I feare not to expose my selfe to the vn. partiall judgement of the best learned, who shall easily determine on which side rest the *Weake Cavils*, and *Sopbistrie*, and on which, the best *Logicke*, and reasons. Wee live not in such an ignorant Age, as cannot discerne weene white and blacke, truthe and errour. Men shal not think to carry it away with big words, the ill weeds of a bad cause. *Proicit ampullas, et sequuntur verba.* But I hasten to the matter. And now judicious Reader, consider what I say, and let the Lord give thee understanding in all things.

Farewell.

---



# MR CHOLMLEY. THE STATE OF THE NOW ROMAN CHURCH. Pag. 1. &c.

Mr Cholmley begins his Defence, as *Tertullus* the Orator his accusation against *Paul*, *Euphrates ap. Tertulli. de la ratione christi. &c. Wee haue found this man a pestilent fellow &c.* And as he begins, so continues all along to the end as if more were to be repos'd in reprochings, & villifyings of my person, then in his arguments against the cause. Thus begging a prejudice of the cause, by laying aspersions vpon my person. But for me, *Nec judicium vereor, nec suspicor praesudicium*: I feare not censure, not suspecting prejudice of the ingenuous judicious Reader, who will measure the cause by Arguments, not the person by words. But let vs heare his proofes & beare his reproofes with patience.

## Pag. 2.

He reduceth all my Sophistry to two heads: 1 *Begge-ry* or *begging the question*: 2 *Disorder*, comparing my arguments to scroles shuffled together in a lottery pott. For the first, the cause I maintaine, is not so poore, as that I need in his sense begge for it. Although (such a hard world it is) a man may long maintaine such causes before it will make him rich. Such advocates may liue and die beggers, for ought I know. For the second, let him draw blindfold where hee will, and he shall haue good lucke if hee hit vpon euer a blanke among all my arguments; though *Anda-ces fortuna iuvat.*

A

But

M. Cholin-  
ley.

But how proues he my beggery? Thus: *The second An-*  
gel powered out his viall vpon the sea, and it became &c.  
*Ergo, the Church of Rome is neither a true Church, nor a true*  
*visible Church. To which I may say farre better, then fiftier*  
*said to Perkins, Apply John Barber, and thou shalt haue*  
*a new paire of Sissers.*

*Reply.*

Beggars must put vp many wrongs, witnesse M Cholinleys Ergo here. yet he referres him to the judicious readers. So I: and then the judicious, yea vulgar reader shall finde no such things as Ergo here put. In the 7 vials pag. 21. any man may see how I illustrate and confirme my exposition of the second viall by the doctrine of Trent. M Cholinleys Ergo therefore concludes nothing for him; but rather giues occasion to the Reader, what to expect of him throughout his booke. And because this whole booke is ouergrown with the superfluity of maliciousnesse wherein lyeth most of his strength, I could wish hee would bestow the new Sissers vpon John Barber to clippe it off.

M. Cholin-  
ley. pag. 3.

But he addeth, *If I wrong him not, every man may see*  
*that he beggeth two things &c.*

*Reply.*

But what if you doe wrong mee, as it is apparant ye  
doe? yet suppose ye wrong mee not: what bee those two  
things I begge? Forsooth, *1 That an allegoricall Prophecie*  
*may be laid for a good foundation to frame an argument to de-*  
*cide a controwersie in Divinity.*

I thought M Cholinleys Ergo, so falsely inferred or rather inforced vpon the premisses, could produce no better a conclusion. Hee offers violence, that would put the roote in place of the foundation. *Diruit, edificat.* Such builders may proue beggers in the end. And doth not M Cholinley bring the beggery vpon himselfe, while hee begges, nay boldly takes, before it be giuen him, such an Ergo? The sea  
(say)

(say I) whereon the second viall is powred, is the do-  
ctrines of Trent. How proue I, or demonstrate that to bee  
true? As there it is set downe by me. Is this then, *The  
second viall powred out &c.* Ergo, *the Church of Rome no  
true Church?* Nay vice veria, the doctrines of Trent be-  
ing such and such, as whereby the Church of *Rome* is de-  
clared to be no true Church: Ergo it is more then proba-  
ble, that this is the meaning of the second viall.

But pag. 4. he sayth, *I for my part cannot suppose it (to wit M. Cholin-  
ley. Pag. 4.  
the second viall) to be yet accomplished.*

*Reply.*

A sound Argument: you suppose it not, Ergo it is not.  
Nor canne you suppose it, till you bee convinced that the  
Church of *Rome* is no true Church. What then? Will you  
then bee perswaded, that the second viall is powred out?

*The other point of his beggery is, that his owne private in-  
terpretation may bee allowed as the true meaning of the Holy- M. Ch. pag. 4  
Ghost. &c.*

*Reply.*

I take the ground of my interpretation from Scripture,  
and therefore not private: and this interpretation proued  
by sufficient demonstration, why may it not bee allowed?  
But that is still the question. I must take heede of playing  
the importunate begger. *What if wee deny* (sayth M. Cholin-  
ley) *this interpretation, and put him to his proofes?* Surely he is  
utterly disappointed, and all his building falls to the ground.  
Yea M. Cholinley tollist subiectum questionis, denies the in-  
terpretation, and proofes, and the accomplishment of the  
Prophecie it selfe.

But what hath M. Colinley, to disproue this interpreta-  
tion? Yes, sayth he, pag. 5. *Because the ground of all is, that  
the Councell of Trent, or the doctrine there of are that bloody  
sea: I suppose it sufficient (if it be otherwise) to turne up all his  
phantasticall cavilation.*

M. Ch. p. 5.

Well: wee erect our best attention to this motion, as the maine *cardo* or hindge of the whole controuersie: only by the way the reader may note, that M'Chol'doth here acquit me of what but even now he accused me: for now the *Doctrine of Trent* is the ground of the vials interpretation, whereas before it was the ergo. But M. Cholinley proue the *Councell of Trent otherwise*, as he sayth, and I will confesse all that I haue sayd thereof is but *meere phantastical canillation*. But if otherwise, I shall desire but *legem talionis*, that hee will bee content to leane the truth with mee, & his *phantastical canillation* where he found it.

M. Cholin.

First therefore I proue it *ex praconcessis*: for he granteth  
 "the same sea whereof (chap. 8. 8. ) the third part was  
 "turned into blood, is here wholly turned therevnto. Now  
 "Brightman (whom in this point he followeth) will haue  
 "that third part of the sea to be the doctrine of *Europe*, the  
 "third part of the Christian world, and then <sup>197. ann. 1545</sup>  
 "the whole sea is the doctrine of the whole Christian  
 "world: but the doctrine of the Councell of *Trent* is not  
 "the doctrine of the whole Christian world: ergo it is not  
 "the sea: here mentioned by *S. Iohn*.

Now surely if M. Cholinley did not trust more to his Sophistry then to his Logick, he would neuer thus argue. Either he must proue, that I so follow M. Brightman, as I altogether tye my selfe to his interpretation, as if I did *Iurare in verba Magistri*, as he is pleased to stile M. Brightman: or else his whole argument falls to ground, and proueth a phantastical *canillation*. And who sees not the proportion betweene the second Trumpet, and second vial? Of the second vial Brightman sayth, *Nunc Occidens sanguinis aquis plectitur: Iam Roma sua agenda partes erant.* Now the West is punished with bloody waters: now *Rome* was to play her part. But passe wee by this cavill to the next.

Second.

"Secondly: But I say, that the Councell of *Trent* hath M. Ch. p. 6.  
 "not a whit corrupted *Romes* doctrines, more then they  
 "were a long time before, Ergo the Council of *Trent* con-  
 "clusions are not here to bee vnderstood. I need not take  
 "paines in the proefe hereof: because the learned do not  
 "accuse it of this fault: but of coosening the world, in pro-  
 "mising a reformation: but instead thereof confirmed  
 "former corruptions of the Church. Only M. *Crawshaw*  
 "mentions one, namely their adding of *Apochrypha* to  
 "Canonicall Scripture; but that also is meant of confirma-  
 "tion, not of innouation.

*Reply.*

*I say, sayth hee. Ipse dixit,* is iufficient. But what if the Councell of *Trent* hath onely confirmed those for generall doctrines to be believed and receiued of all which before were but particular opinions in that Church, which all men were not tyed of necessity to receiue and believe, but were contradicted of many. To confirme that now to be *de iure & de fide*, to be a rule of faith, which before was onely *de facto* in practise among them, and that among some one-  
 Hanc concu-  
 ly, is this no corruption? But this (by M. *Cholinleys* owne päsentiam, quā  
 confession) was done by the Councell of *Trent*. Was it *stolus peccatum* ever held a generall doctrine of that Church, that Con-  
 cupiscence was no sinne? And yet that blasphemous Coun-  
 cell, expressly, and namely against the Apostle, decrees it *Sancta Synodus decla-*  
 to bee no sinne. I might instance in many particulars  
 more, as in the point of justification, of saving faith, of the  
 Priests intention, and the like. But especially of the rule of  
 faith. M. *Cholinley* cites only his old friend M. *Crawshaw*, *rat Ecclesiam*  
 telling of the addition of the *Apochrypha* to the *Chanon-* *Catholica nū-*  
 call Scriptures. But hath he never read the late reverend  
 B. of *Chichester* D<sup>r</sup> *Carleton* his learned booke *de Ecclesia*, *quam intelle-*  
 wherein he sheweth excellently how the rule of faith was  
 first altered by the councell of *Trent*? And how? Not  
 onely by adding the *Apochrypha*, but all their falsly so cal-  
 led Apostolical Traditions, & withall their Decretals, &  
*appellat. Sancta Synodus decla-*  
*de pecc. orig.*  
*appellare &c.*  
*Sess. 5. Decret.*

above all the authority of the Church, and the Oracle of the Popes breſt. So as the Pope in his Bull calſ those definitions of *Trent* *Constitutiones nouas, new Constitutions.* And well he might. And whereas, before the Councell of *Trent*, many of the damnable doctrines therein concluded, were held *Pro & Con* among the Schoolemen: now the whole Clergie of that Hierarchy muſt ſweare to receiue them as matters of faith, nor to bee questioned any more. And all this to be held ſo irrefragable, as it muſt ſtand, *Non obſtantibus Constitutionibus, & ordinationibus Apostolicis, alijsq; in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque: Notwithstanding Apostolick Constitutions, and Ordinances, and others to the contrary whatſoever.* Is not all this a whit to corrupt Romes doctrines, more then they were long before the Councell of *Trent*. Did not Pope *Innocent 3* in the Councell of *Læſteran* being in a horrible corruption, even an abominable Idoll into the Church, notwithstanding hee did but decree & ratifie Transubſtantiation to be of all beleeued of necessity, which before that time had bin but arbitrary? The like may be ſayd of the Councell of *Conſtance* Decree, of ſhutting out the Sacred Cup. But the Councell of *Trent* ſurpaſſeth in this kind all that went before it. So as *Calvin* in his Antidote againſt the Councell of *Trent* ſayth, *Vix unus eſt versus, qui non aliquo notabilis errore conſpersus ſit, & qui diſſimulationē non ferat:* There is ſcarce one verſe of it, which is not leauened with ſome notable error, and which cannot be diſembled. To conclude this, ſay, the Church of *England* ſhould ratifie Armenian doctrines, now adaiies published by priuate ſpirits and that with allowance and pretended to be the doctrines of our Church, & ſhould make them her publicke doctrines, with what conſcience (M. *Cholmley*) could you ſubſcribe to her *Articles*?

But beſides this, what can M. *Cholmley* ſay to the *Index Expurgatorius*, neuer hatched before that Councell of *Trent*, but by it invented, and by the Pope confirmed? But more of this anon. And to helpe all this, what ſayth hee of the

the new and last order of the Jesuites, erected in the time of that Councell by the Pope? Did euer hell hatch such a miscreant & mischievous brood, the most matchlesse and activest instruments to propagate & execute those *Trent* Decrees through all the Papall world.

But proceed wee to M<sup>r</sup> Cholmleys 3<sup>rd</sup> argument.

" Thirdly, I say, that the Councell of *Trent* hath reformed *Romes* doctrine, and made it ( at least in one point ) M<sup>r</sup>. Cholm. " better then it was before: ergo it is not here to bee understood. The point is this: That there is no naturall ability in a man to prepare himselffe for grace, & so no merit of congruity, in which regard *Stapleton* sayth, *Meritū ex congruo explosum est*: a point of no small moment in these dayes.

*Reply.*

M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley, as it seemeth, is willing rather to play small play, then to give out. But I am sorry hee should lay downe his credit at stake, at such a game, wherein hee bewrayes such palpable ignorance. Or hath his loue and zeale to defend the Councell of *Trent*, and to oppose mee, cast a myst ouer his eyes? But for his better information I wish hee would read the history of the Councell of *Trent*, 2 booke. Also *Chemnitius* his *Examen* vpon the sixt Session of *Trent*; and if hee please, my booke of *Iustification* chap. 2. and my *Plea* to the *Appeale*, pag. 71. And for the present to satisfie the Reader in this point, it is a matter very remarkable to obserue the subtile dissimulation and hypocrisie of the Councell of *Trent* in this very point; wherein they carried themselues so cunningly in the setting of it downe (I meane the point of Merit before *Iustification*) that both *Vega* who held the merit of congruity before *justification*, and *Soto*, who opposed it, were both well pleased, as hauing both their opinions ratified by the Councell. For in some it was the Councils craft not once to name the Schoole-termes of congruity and con-

dignity.

dignity, but to content themselves which the general word  
 merit, which equiuocally might haue relation either to  
 Congruity or condignity, and hereunto adding the equiuoc-  
 ally voice of grace, sometimes meant of the first grace,  
 sometimes of the second: by this meanes the Councells  
 decree became as a Delphicke oracle, to fit both *Vega* the  
 franciscan, and *Soto* the Dominican. And yet to make it  
 cleare to all judicious eyes, that the Councell of *Trent*  
 hath not abrogated but confirmed the *Merit of Congruity*:  
 note the Councells words, the title of the 5 chapter, Sess.  
 6. *De necessitate &c.* Of the necessity of preparation to ju-  
 stification. And cap. 5. *ad conuertendum se &c.* to convert  
 themselues to their justification. But especially cap. 7.  
*Institutum in nobis recipientis &c.* receiuing righteousnesse  
 in our selues, or being iustified by inherent righteousnesse  
 every one according to his measure, which the Holy  
 Ghost distributeth every one, euen as he will, & according  
 to euery mans proper disposition, & cooperation &c. And  
 against *Stapleton*, let mee oppose *Osias*, alledged by *Chem-  
 nissius*, to wit, *Synodus Tridentinam maluisse appellare pre-  
 parationes, vel dispositiones ad gratiam, quam meritum con-  
 grui*: that the *Trent* Councell chose rather to name pre-  
 parations and dispositions to grace, then Merit of Congru-  
 ity. Where vpon *Chemnissius* addeth: and, sayth hee,  
 "let the reader diligently note this, that the Councell of  
 "Trent by the word Preparation, and Disposition, doth  
 "vnderstand the same thing, which the Schoolemen doc;  
 "whē they dispute of the merit of congruity. For in those  
 "very dispositions of the Schoolemen about merit of  
 "congruity, every where do the words Preparation and  
 "Disposition resound; as there hee sets downe sundry in-  
 stances. In a word I oppose *Bellarmino* to *Stapleton*,  
 who going about to elide the Scripture about justifica-  
 tion freely by grace, vrged by Protestants, sayth, Re-  
 spondeo, *Particula illa gratis duobus modis accipi potest;  
 uno modo, &c.* I answere (sayth he) the particle *Gratis*, or  
 Freely

Rom. 3.

*Bellarmino de Iust.*  
ib. 1, cap. 21.

Freely, may be taken two wayes: the one is, as it may bee opposed to debt of lustice, or merites of congruity, as Divines speake, which are absolutely and simply merits. And thus, free Iustification doth not exclude works, which may be said to concurre to Iustification, as Dispositions, or as merites of congruity, provided wee doe not attribute to them merite of condignity, whereof the Council of Trent speaketh in the sixt Session, chap. 8. where it sayth. A man is justified freely, because neither faith nor works, which goe before Iustification, doe merite it. *Et iuxta hunc modum, &c.* And according heereunto it is not one and the same; for a man to be iustified freely, and to be iustified by faith alone. For to be iustified freely, is to be iustified without the merit of condignity. To bee iustified by faith alone, is to haue nothing required to iustification, but faith, which how false it is, wee haue already shewed. So *Bellarmino*. Where note two principall particulars: 1 that by Dispositions vnto Iustification he vnderstands Merits of Congruity, he accounts them convertible termes; So that the Councill of Trent speaking of Dispositions and Preparations to Iustification, intends thereby nothing els, but Merites of Congruity. 2 that this Councell of Trent, saying, *A man is iustified freely, vnderstands it in regard of merit of Congruity: it excludes merits of condignity as going before Iustification, but not merits of Congruity.* Thus we see the vanity of M. Cholmleys third reason, and the swelling emptiness of his vnderstanding in the mysteries of Trent.

Come we to his 4<sup>th</sup> reason.

Fourthly, I say, that there is as much fresh water in *Romes* M. Ch. p. 8. doctrines since the Council of Trent, as there was before: *Ergo* it is not here to be vnderstood: This I proue by the doctrin of the Tridentin Catechisme; in euery part whereof there is sufficient quantity of sauing doctrin for those, that (to vse your own words) can search & find it out, separating the good frō the bad, & truth frō error: as may appeare to them that will take the paines to read it: yea, I dare be bold to say, the Church of Roine had not for many

hundred yeares before the Councell of Trent, so good a forme of doctrine, as that Catechisme containeth: which I speake not to justifie the Councell, or the Catechisme in any errorre comprehended therein, but onely to shew the beggery of the adversary: of which this shall bee sufficient.

*Reply.*

How? As much fresh waters in Romes doctrines since the Councell of Trent, as before? What say you then ( M. Cholmley ) to the Tridentine *Index expurgatorius*, whose office it is, like a great Limbeck, to extract and draw away out of their riuers ( I meane their Authours before the Councell of Trent ) whatsoeuer fresh waters of fundametall and sauing truth were found in them. For the purpose, whatsoeuer is found in Catholicke authors ( as they call them ) directly or exprestly repugnant to the Trent-Canons and Decrees, as touching *Justification*, *Merit*, *Invocation*, *Adoration*, or any other Popish trumpery, it must bee purged away in this Expurgatory Index. See their Indices printed at Madrid 1584, and reprinted one at Strasburg 1609, in 8: another at Salmuri in 4 1601. Where the reader may finde these and the like sentences to bee spuuged out, as out of Antonius Abbas his Sermons, *Eam vero solummodo naturam, qua increata est, colere, ac venerari debemus*: That nature only, which is vncreated, wee ought to adore and worship. Out of Ferus on Math. 12. *Christus hic aperte pronunciat nos ex natura nostra malis arbores esse*: Christ here openly pronounceth, that wee by our nature are euill trees. Out of Chrysostome, do verbis Pauli, Not onely this, but wee glory in afflictions, tom. 3. p. 945. *Nullis oneris, aut laboriosis, aut molestis mandatis impositis, sed fide tantum requisita, & iustificavit nos, & sanctos reddidit, &c*: By no burthenosome, or toylesome, or troublesome commandements injoyned, but by faith only required, God hath both iustified and sanctified vs. And in Pjal. 95. *Si quid dicitur absq;*

abſt. Scriptura, auditorū cogitatio claudicat, nūc annhens, nūc  
hesitans, &c. If any thing be spoken without Scripture, the  
minde of the hearers halteth, now affenting, now doubting,  
&c. Out of a book intituled *Ordo baptizandi, cum modo viſi-  
tandi*: printed at *Venice* 1576: *Credis non propriis meritis, sed  
passionis Domini nostri Iesu Christi virtute ac merito ad glo-  
riam pervenire?* &c. Dost thou beleeue to come to glory not  
by thine owne merits, but by the vertue and merite of the  
Passion of our Lord Iesus Christ? Yea this *Index Expu-  
gariorum*, to shew what a good-will it hath to be fingering  
the sacred Scripture it ſelfe hath not ſpared ſentences of  
Scripture, ſet downe by Authors in their workes. As in the  
*Index of Robert Stephens* vpon the bookeſ of the Olde and  
New Testament, many ſuch like ſentences, as theſe, muſt  
out: as, *Omnis, qui vivit, & credit in me, non morietur in aet-  
ernum: Euery one that liueth, & beleeueth in me, ſhal not dye* *Ioh.11.26*  
*for euer. Nihil discrevit inter nos et illos, fide purificans cor-  
da eorum: He put no diſference betweene vs and them, pu-* *Act.15.9.*  
*rifying our hearts by faith. Scientes autem, &c.* Knowing  
that a man is not justified by the workes of the Law, but *Gal.2.16.*  
by the faith of Iesus Christ; and we haue beleeued in Iesus  
Christ, that we may be justified by the faith of Christ, and  
not by the deeds of the Law. And that *1 Cor.1.30.* And of  
him are yee in Christ Iesus, who of God is made vnto vs  
wisedome, and righteousness, and ſanctification, and re-  
demption. And that *Psal.143. or 142. 2.* Enter not into  
judgement with thy ſeruant, for in thy ſight ſhall no man  
liuing be justified. All theſe, and infinite catalogues more  
of diuine truths, are by the Tridentine *Index* to bee purged  
out of all ſuch Authors, as we haue mentioned, which were  
before the Councell of Trent, besides all Protestant bookeſ  
whatſoever, which as totally hereticall, are catalogued for  
prohibited bookeſ. So that wee muſt know that now ſince  
the Councell of Trent, no Pontifician Writer muſt publish  
any thing containing any ſuch doctriues of ſauing truth, as  
we ſee cancelled by the *Index*. Yea in their vulgar *Cate-  
chifmes*

chimes they haue left out the second Commaundement, which forbiddeth Image-worship. All this and much more well considered, how proues your saying true, *M Cholmley*, that there is as much fresh water in Romes doctrines since the Councell of Trent, as before?

But you proue it by the Doctrine of the Tridentine Catechisme, in every part wherenf is sufficient quantity of sauing doctrine. Where can you show any one point of sauing doctrine in any one part of that Catechisme? For pag. 7. for the rule of faith it teacheth Traditions, as a part of the word of God, and so a part, as both by the Priests pressing, & the peoples practise, the Scripture is shouldered out, & musled vp. Pag. 9. Their faith is no other but an assent to divine things deliuered; and this faith must depend vpon the authority and approbation of the Church. Pag. 49. it teacheth there is a Purgatory fire, wherein the soules of the godly after this life being for a certaine time tormented, are expiated or purged, that so an entrance into the eternall countrey may bee opened vnto them, into which entreth no uncleane thing. Ac de huius, &c. And of the truth of this doctrine, which sacred Councells declare to be confirmed both by testimonies of Scripture, & by Apostolick Tradition, the Parish Priest shall diligently and frequently increate, because we are fallen into those times wherein men cannot endure wholesome doctrine. This belike is one of those sauing and wholesome doctrines, mentioned or meant by *M Cholmley*. Pag. 50. this Catechisme teacheth, that Christ descended into hell to free just and holy men from that miserable Prison, Pag. 257. Duplex, &c. The power Ecclesiastical is twofold: of order, and of iurisdiction. The power of order hath reference to the true body of our Lord Christ in the sacred Eucharist, &c. And pag. 259. Order is truly & properly to be called a Sacrament: wherfore the B<sup>r</sup> reaching the chalice with wine & water, & the Paten with bread, to him that is ordained Priest, saith, Take thou a power to offer sacrifice, &c. And pag. 266. Accipe potestate, &c. Take thou a power to offer sacrifice to God, & to celebrate Masses as well for

for the living, as for the dead: by which ceremonies & words is  
instituted the Interpreter & Mediator of God & men, which is  
to be esteemed the principall function of the Priest. Ad extremū  
verō &c. And in the last place, the power of binding & loosing  
is given to him. Pag. 394. Secundo loco, In the second place, we  
fly to the help of Saints in Heauen. Pag. 395. Illud etiam, &c.  
This also in the explication of this Cōmandement (to wit, the  
first cōmandement, Thou shalt haue no other Gods but me)  
is diligently to be taught, that the veneration and invocation of  
Saints and blessed soules, which injoy celestiall glory, or els the  
worship which the Catholike Church hath euer vsed towards  
their bodies, and their holy asbes is not repugnant to this Law;  
and so along concerning image-worship to the 301 page,  
where the Parish Priest is cōmanded to follow the Decrees  
of the Tridentine Councell, & to expound the same where  
need is to his people. Many more instances of the same stuff  
frō the Romane Catechisme might be gathered. But these  
may suffice for a proofe. Now all this while, & all along, I  
cannot finde those sauing doctrines, whereof M Cholmley  
speaketh, vnlesse these be they. Els, I leaue him to find them  
out; & because his iudgment is aboue the capacity of an or-  
dinary reader, he shall doe well, first to separate the good frō  
the bad, and truth from error, before he send the Readers to  
that catechisme, lest in that golden cup, so double gilded  
with his cōmendations, they may drink the deadly poison,  
in stead of sauing doctrine. Before he send a man through  
such a rocky sea, he had need first to marke out all the dan-  
gerous hidden rocks & shelues, for feare of shipwrack. But  
M Cholm. acknowledgeth he cōmends not the catechisme  
or Cōcouncil, to iustify any error cōprehended therein. I hope  
you doe not M Cholm. What then? What hath transported  
you thus to magnifie the Trent-Councell & Catechisme?  
Surely only to shew the beggery of the adversary. Alas that  
beggery can find no better fauor in the eies of your charity  
thē thus disgracefully & importunatly to presse it vpō your  
poore brother. How often haue you had it vp? you haue

by this time reproached me these ten times, and are not ashamed. Beggary you haue worne thred bare, like a beggers weede. But if you haue thus compelled mee like the sturdie begger to wrest from you by cleane strength of demonstration, a concession of the cause, about which you quarrelled me: blame your selfe, and not me.

But what's next?

M. Cholin.  
pag.9.

The second thing hee chargeth mee withall, is disorder. *His disorder shewes it selfe in 3 things: 1 in not setting the state of the question: Secondly, in misplacing his owne arguments. Thirdly, in idle repetitions.*

Reply.

Thus in order *Disorder* followes beggary. But for the first point of *Disorder*, the Reader will excuse mee, sith I handled the point but in *transiſu, & obiter*, by the way, not otherwise. Againe, I tooke it for granted, and to bee *extra aſcam contraversie*, that all men knew well enough what was meant by the *Church of Rome*, without any more adoe. For the second, may not a man place his owne arguments, as him pleaseth? If M<sup>r</sup> Cholinley can picke out his owne advantage from my misplacing, hee may rather thanke me, then quarrell me. But the mischiefe is, he quarrelleth my misplacing of my arguments, as done *artificially* (ſaith he) for his best advantage. Pardon me this fault M<sup>r</sup> Cholinley. For the third, *Idle repetitions*; and a little lower, *much babbling*: when you ſhow wherein, it will bee ſoone enough to frame an anſwere. But in all yours I cannot finde one ſingle ſound confutation.

But the maine thing is, not ſtateing the question. I ſay, I tooke it as granted of all, that all professing themſelues Papists, and to adhere to the Pope as their Head, both Cleargy and Laity make vp this *Church of Rome*, as M<sup>r</sup> Cholinley himſelfe layes it down, pag. 10. ſaying, ſometimes (& moſt vſually) it comprehendeth all the national Churches which communicate with *Rome* in the ſame faith, and vnder the ſame

(19)

same Head, the Pope, commonly called the Catholike Roman Church. But whereas he sayth pag. 11, sometimes the Papacy or Apostacy in that Church, which is S. Johns Babylon, is taken for the Church of Rome: this is no distinct acception of the Church of Rome from the former, as now the Church of Rome standeth, as wee shall shew anon; the Church of Rome being now a generall visible Apostacy, the question in hand. For his other divisions I passe ouer, as not materiall to the question. But whereas pag. 11: he makes soundnes (which I suppose he meaneth of doctrin) to be the accidental to a true Church: he must giue me leaue to deny this: for soundnes of doctrine (if that bee his meaning) is not accidentall, but essentiall to constitute a true Church of God. Also his third branch of a Church visible in regard of the true markes of it, is very defective, and comes short of the purpose, while hee sets not downe expressly which bee those markes of a true Church. So as his owne stating of the question is defective in the maine point, to wit, in setting downe the true markes of a true, or visible true Church. For the maine question controverred, is, not, whether there bee a secret number of Gods Elect within the verge of the Church of Rome, as yet vncalled, vncalled out, which M. Cholmley makes one of his members of the acception of the Church of Rome: nor, whether God haue a hidden people, or Churche which is the Romane Church, and yet communicateth not with her abominations, which some call the Church in the wildernes, and which M. Cholmley makes another member of the acception of the Church of Rome: but the maine question (I say) is, whether the Church of Rome, consisting of the Pope the Head, and of all Papists his members, openly avowing and avouching the same, bee a visible Church of Christ. In the vpshot M. Cholmley states the question thus: *Although diverse men doe set the state of the question diversly, as may best serue for their owne private ends and purposes: yet I will take it in the largest extena, and as it may bee most*

Pag. 11.

fa.

faouurable for the Church of Rome. But M. Cholmley should so state the question, as may be, not *most faouurable for the Church of Rome* (for so it may be suspected, as best seruing for his owne private ends and purposes (which he blameth in others) but most agreeable to the truth of the cause in hand.

But he states it thus: Whether the Catholike Church of Rome (as it is called in opposition to the Diocese) in regard of the whole body thereof compounded of Clergy and Laity, be still within the Covenant of Gods sauing grace: and haue such markes of that covenant still abiding in it, that though properly at once and altogether it cannot be visible, yet by peccaineale, and successiuee, surely it may truely be said so to be. And so much for the state of the question. So he.

Now for this manner of stating the question, wee haue just cause to except against it: 1 in regard of some termes superfluous and improper. 2 for some things obscure: and 3 for the maine Defects of it. 1 That he calls the Church of Rome Catholick, the Church of Rome hath cause to thank him, & sound Protestants to be offended: That he qualifies it, *As it is called in opposition to the Diocese*: this is impertinent to the purpose & question in hand. For the question is not of the Diocese of Rome, but of the whole Church. And the whole Church of Rome is not opposed to, but comprehendeth the Diocese. Now although Catholick signify properly Universall; yet in the Church of Romes sense, it is taken for the true, Orthodoxe, Catholike Church, without which is no saluation. And doth not M. Cholmley know that in calling themselues Catholickes, they brand vs for Hereticks: For Catholike & Heretick are euer opposite. Let him take heed therefore he conclude not himselfe an Hereticke, that cōfeseth the Church of Rome Catholike, For more surety therefore he should haue said (vnder correction) *the whole Church, not, the Catholike Church of Rome*. 2 for his obscurity: as, he expresseth not what he meaneth by being within the covenant of Gods sauing grace. And to speake properly, none are within the Covenant of Gods sauing

saving grace, but only Gods Elect in Christ: but M. Cholmley cannot shew that the whole Church of Rome cōpounded of Clergy & laity, are Gods elect in Christ; & therefore he cānot say, that the Church of *Rome* is within the covenāt of Gods saving grace. Neither doth M. Cholmley show this throughout his whole booke. Againe he dasheth vpon a sophisme & *bene cōiunctis ad male divisa*, from the whole to a part, from the Vniversal to a particular, in saying, *That though properly at once & altogether it cannot be visible, yet by peccemeale, & successiuely it may truly be said so to be.* For if it haue the true markes of Gods covenāt still abiding in it, & those appearing in the publicke Ministratiōn; what should hinder, that such a Church should not properly at once, & altogether, *rebus sic stātibus*, be visible? yet M. Chol. seems to say that the Church may haue the true markes of visibility, & yet not be visible. otherwile for my part, I vnderstād him not. And it is requisite, to the stating of a question, that it be set downe in most cleare & expresseful termes, void of obscurity or ambiguity. <sup>31</sup> as his stating of the questiō is improper, obscure, ambiguous, & sophistical: so it is very defective, & comes not home.

To make this appear, the intire stating, or putting of the questiō ought to be thus: whether the Church of R. cōsisting of one visible head the Pope, & of all Papists wheresoever & whatsoever, Clergy & Laity, professing themselves mēbers of that head; be a true & visible Church of Christ, that is, such as in the intire faith & doctrine therof defined, & decreed in the Coucill of *Trent*, men liuing & dying, are or may be saued.

Now wheras it may be objected, there are sundry differēt opiniōs in that Church, held by priuate sects, or persōs, dissōnat frō the general ietled doctrines therof, as about the merit of cōgruity, certainty of saluation, & the like: this hindereth not the generality of the questiō thus stated. For all their priuate opiniōs must vaile bonnet, & appeale to the determinatiō of the Pope, who stiffly maintains the irrefragable *decrees* & *canōs* of *Trent*, which their whole clergy are solēnly sworn to keepe inviolable. Not are any of them permitted without <sup>Bulla confirmatiōnis.</sup> speciall authority frō the Pope to make their interpretatiōs,

C

or to

to write commentaries vpon the same *Decrees*; and if they shall seeme to any man to be obscure, and to need interpretation, or explanation: *ascendat ad locum &c.* let him go vp to the place which the Lord hath chosen, namely the sea Apostolcke, the Mistris of all the faithfull &c. For wee (sayth the Pope, the Oracle of the Church of *Rome*) haue referred to our selues all difficulties, and controuersies, which might arise from the said *Decrees*, to bee by vs declared and decided, as also the holy Synod hath decreed; and if any thing bee wittingly or ignorantly attempted to the contrary, wee decree the same to be void and of no force. This is the Popes definitiue sentence in the Bull of *Pius 4.* in confirmation of the *Tridentine Council*: Thus all Papists of what sort or sect soeuer, whatsoeuer their opinions be, if they swerue from the Decrees of *Trent*, which containe the irrefragable canon rule of Popish faith and religion, they are declared to bee mereley void by the Popes owne *Decree*, and the authours themselves fall vnder the curse of both *Pope* and *Council*: So as whatsoeuer is predicated or defined of the Church of *Rome* in generall is also predicated of all and every member and part thereof, all being joynly combined in one head, the Pope, and all confined to the *Decrees and Canons of Trent*, and to the Popes breſt the *Oracle* of all, and that vnder *Anathema*. But (as I touched before) if there shall be any in that Church, whom God hath referred to himselfe, who haue not bowed the knee to *Baal*, who abhorre the Idolatry and tyranny of Antichrist: yea, say there should be many thouſands of ſuch, lurking in corners within the compaſſe of the Papall Dominions: yet it cannot hereupon bee inferred and concluded, that the Church of *Rome* is a true visible, or visible true Church; because ſuch as are ſo ſeparated and ſelected by God, and referred to himſelfe, who truely belieue in Christ according to the Scriptures, are ſo farre from being members of the Church of *Rome*, as they are by the doome of *Trent* ſentenced and accursed

for

for heretickes; & cut off quite from that Church, although they yet liue in it.

The state of the question thus laid and cleared, proceed we to the rest which followeth.

My first argumēt (as M. Cholmley there sets it down) is. *Pag. 14.15.*  
"That Church which denieth, yea accursteth the sauing faith &c.  
" of Iesus Christ vnto justification, allowing onely such a *Vials p.24.*  
"faith, which can never saue a man, but is a gracelesse faith,  
"separable from grace, and which a man may carry with  
"him into hell; that is an apostatized Church, vtterly fal-  
"lenaway from grace, wherein no saluation is to be found  
"or hoped for.

" But the Church of *Rome* doth all this: Ergo.

" To which I answe, by denying all: I deny the Pro. *M. Cholm.*  
" position, because it is sophistical; the assumpſion, because  
"it is falſe: and I need not then doubt to deny the conclusi-  
"on. The Proposition is ſicke of that Sophisme, which the  
"Logitians call *secundum plures interrogaciones, or proposi-*  
"tiones: that is, when many propositions are joyned toge-  
"ther in one, whereof ſome are true, ſome falſe: as here are  
"at leaſt three: one, that the Church ( ſo bablingly descri-  
"bed) is an Apostatized Church: another that it is vtterly  
"fallen away from Christ: a third, that no ſaluation is to  
"be found or hoped for therein. Of which, the first onely  
"is true, & the rest notoriously falſe and againſt the Scrip-  
"ture. For first &c.

### Reply.

Now good reader, let mee but ſet downe mine owne argument, as it ſtands *totidem verbis*, *Vials*, pag. 24: and then judge of M. Cholmleys dealing in his ſetting of it downe. It is thus:

*That Church which denyeth the onely meaneſ of ſaluation by Christ, is no true Church of Christ, but ſuch as wherein ſaluation is not to be expected.*

*But the Church of Rome denyeth the onely meaneſ by*  
C. 2 *Christ,*

Christ, yea accuseth it, to wit, the iustifying and sauing faith of Christ. Therefore the Church of Rome is no true Church of Christ, but such as wherein no salvation is to bee expeted.

Now for M. Cholmeley to heape vp more particulars into my argument, then I haue set downe, & then to charge me with sophisme, and babling: this is, as hee that closely conveyed two or three siluer spoones into his neighbours pocket, & then layd a fellony to his charge. How need we maruaile, that a language pleading so for Babell, should proue any other then babling.

But admit all those things had bin in my propositiō: how is it a sophisme, if they be not only true, but *homogenea*, pertinent to expresse one & the same thing proposed? euery one of those branches marking out the Church of *Rome*, & prouing her in the Assūption, to be no true Church. Therefore to take them, as he layes the down: first he confesseth that the Church of *Rome* is an apostatized Church. But the rest (faith hee) are notoriously false, & against the Scripture; *as to deny, yea to accuse sauing faith, & to allow the contrary, is not a point of totall & finall Apostacy, unles it be joyned with malice & obstinacy, & bee the sinne against the holy Ghost, to which repentance is utterly denied.* Else (faith he) *what shall we say of S. Peter, who both denied & cursed the knowledge of Christ in himself?* M. Chol. hath here expressed enough to confirme what I say. For first (though anon he peremptorily denyeth it) he seemeth to grant that the apostatized Church of *Rome* doth deny & accuse the sauing faith: only he would excuse this from a totall & finall apostacy as not joyned with malice, & obstinacy, for this he alledged Peters exāple. But how impertinently? For first Peter did not deny & accuse the sauing faith of Christ: 2<sup>o</sup>, Peters deniall of his Master was of frailty, his feare being for the present strongly assaulted, & overcome: 3<sup>o</sup>, Peter eftsoons repented himselfe and was restored. But it fāreth farre otherwise with the Church of *Rome*; for her denying and accusing the sauing faith of Christ, is joyned with an extreame deliberate malice, and maintained.

ed with an invincible obstinacie, and that ratified by the irrefragable *Decrees & Canons of Trent*, to which their whole Cleargy is bound by soleinne oath, and that vnder paine of *Anathema*. So as this denying and accursing of the sauing faith hath beene, & is still maintained euer since the Councel of Trent, & is never like to be repealed, vntesse the Pope call another Councell, to repeale & make voyd that of Trent, which is like to be *ad gratas Calendas*, when the Pope & his followers purpose to turne *Protestants*. And therefore for M Cholmeleyes Secondly, &c. what saluation may be found & hoped for in the Church of *Rome*, in the interim, notwithstanding that *denyall & execration* of sauing faith, & *approbatio* of the contrary: I leaue him in that hope.

pag. 15.

But thirdly (saith he) it wold be remembred, that our question is of the whole body of the Church, that is, neither of the popular part only, nor of the representatiue only, but of both together: if then the one parts only shall doe as he saith, & not the whole body, who can say that there is no Saluation to be found therein, or that it is utterly fallen away from Christ. So much for the proposition.

Reply.

*Memini, gametsi nullus moneas.* I remember it well M' Cholmley. And you must remember too, that herein you vary frō your self in your stating the question, as we have noted before. But where you speake of the whole body of the Church, you must remēber, you meane no other, but the Church of *Rome*. Again, what meane you by your distribution into the popular and representatiue part? Do you meane by the popular, the Church of *Rome* in general, & by the representatiue, the councel of Trent? or by the popular, the laity; & by the representatiue, the Clergy, though very improper? But whatsoeuer you meane, it is to very small purpose. For which, or what one part can you either demonstre, or make it probable to vs, that they hold otherwise, then the couēl of Trent hath defined. The clergy? why, they are all sworne to the contrary. The lay-people? Alas, which way shall those blindlings goe, but where their guides lead them? The Scripture is shut vp frō them, in an vnown known tongue

C 3

2nd

M. Cholm-  
ley. pag. 5.

and by Papall prohibition. What other confession of faith then can be expected frō them, but *to believe as the Church of Rome beleeveth*? And M. Cholmley might remember that *faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God*. But *how shall they heare, without a Preacher? And how shall they preach without they besent?* And who dare preach otherwise then the *Council of Trent* hath peremptorily prescribed?

M. Cholm.

But he descends to the *Assumption*, or *minor proposition* of my former argument: In the next place, I say, the assumption is evidently false, if not more then slāderous. For first the Church of *Rome* (whether partially, or wholly vnderstood,) never denied, never accused saving & justifying faith, nor euer allowed a gracelesse faith only, which cannot saue: looke vpon all the Canons of the Councell of *Trent*, and see whether any such thing bee to bee found therein, or gathered therefrom: Doth it not distinguish betweene a liuing and a dead faith? And doth it not say, that the liuing faith onely justifieth, and not the dead? what is it then, that it denyeth and accuseth? It is this, first the forme and manner of justification by faith: whē it is said to justifie, as the very forme of justification, and not as a meere disposition thereto. Secōdly this assertion, that a dead faith, separate from grace, is not a true fayth, though it cannot justifie; this is that, which the Councell denyeth and accuseth in this case and no more: yet you say boldly, if not impudently, pag. 25. If any dare deny this, he will but bewray his shamelesse ignorance in this point. In what point M. Burton. That the Councell of *Trent* admitteth of no other faith, than that which the Deuill and damned in hell haue? O mouth! O forehead! Haue they a liuing faith, which is fruitfull in good workes? Such a faith as S. James commendeth? and doth not the Councell admit of this faith? yea of this onely for justification? Read the latter part of the seauenth chapter of the sixt Session, and be ashamed.

Reply

Pardon mee, good reader, it in a point of such consequence so pertinent to the question in hand, I set downe the authors words at length; and the rather because I heare his bookees proued but a hard bargain to the Printer, or at least to the booke-sellers, finding but few buyers. Now for answere, first I reterre thee to what I haue breefely sette downe in this point in my *Plea to the Appela*, pag. 72: and more largely in my booke of *Justification*, intituled *Truths triumph ouer Trent*: which by Gods speciall prouidence came forth two or three dayes before that of M. *Butterfeelds*, and this of M. *Cholmeleys*, wherein this maine exception of his, as it were by diuine preuention, is inette withall. Yet I will adde a word or two here for thy present satisfaction, and for the repressing of the Aduersaries importune insolence.

Now let vs see, whether my *Affumption*, or M. *Cholmeleys* assertion, is evidently false, if not more then flandrous: and which of vs hath the mouth and forehead, boldly, if not impudently, (to vse his own language) to avouch an vntruth, I against, or hee for, the *Councell of Trent*. The summe of my defence, is to proue that the *Councell of Trent* denyeth and accursteth the *justifying and sauing faith* of Christ. To proue and evince this, first take we a definition of *justifying faith* from our mother *Church of England*: *Justifying faith, is not onely a common belief of the Articles of our faith, but also a true trust and confidence of the mercy of God through our Lord Iesus Christ, and a stedfast hope of all good things to bee received at Gods hand.* And a little lower, *It is a sure ground and foundation, a Certificate and sure looking for. It is an assured faith and trust in God.* And pag. 23. *The very sure & lively Christian faith, is an earnest trust and confidence in God, that hee doth regard vs for his onely sonnes sake &c.* This faith, in the same homily, our Church distinguishing in kind from the *historicall faith*, or the *faith of*

*Homily of*  
*faith part. I.*  
*Pag. 22,*

of assent, which is in the Diuels and damned; according to the Scriptures. Now the *Council of Trent*, doth flatly and expressly deny and curse this kind of faith, which our Church hath defined to bee a *Confidence in Gods mercy*. And that three wayes. 1 It denies the kind of this faith. 2 the prime qualities of it: 3 the proper vse of it. First, the *Council of Trent*, denyeth the very kind of this sauing faith, allowing of none other kind of faith, but the histori-call, which is a general assent to the truth reuealed: Sess.6. c.6. This is that only faith which they teach, as in the *Roman Catechisme*, set forth by the decree of the Pope & Councell of *Trent*, where their onely faith is thus defined: *Fides est cuius vi omnino assentimur ijs quae tradita sunt dignitatis*: Faith is that by vertue whereof wee assent to those things, which are deliuiered by God. And a little lower, to shew wherevpon this their faith is grounded; it is added: *Fides est, cuius virtus efficit, ut id ratum habeamus, quod a Deo traditum esse sanctissima matris Ecclesie auctoritas comprobaret*: Faith causeth, that we hold those things for true which the authority of our most holy mother the Chureh hath approued to be deliuiered of God.

Note here then in the first place, how that kind of faith, which the Church of *Rome* onely teacheth and avoweth, building it also vpō humaine authority, & not primarily, & solely vpon the diuine Scriptures, and vpon the authority of God speaking therein, condemnes our Church for the dead faith, common to the Diuels and damned. So that hence it is plaine, that the faith of the Church of *Rome* is merely humaine, as built vpon mans authority, and not vpon Gods, vpon the Church of *Rome*, and not vpon the Scriptures; so as neither the Scripture, nor any one Article of the Creed is believed of them, but so farre as the authority of the Church of *Rome* giueth them approbation. And thus the Church of *Rome* doth not beleeue simply any one Article of the Creed, but ouerturneth all.

*Ob.* But sayth M. *Cholmley*, Doth not the *Council of Trent*

*Catech. Rom.*  
cap. 1.

Trent distinguishe a liuing and a dead faith.

*Answe.* Howsoeuer they distinguish in words, yet indeed it is but one kinde of faith, which they holde; and they call it *dead* before hope and charity be together, with it infused, and then it is *liuing*, say they: but after grace, to wit, hope and charity is lost, it is dead, as it was before. And againe, they say, that when *grace* is lost, yet *faith* is not alwayes lost; and that *faith* which remaineth, though it bee dead, yet is the *true faith*. Where you see how they plainly distinguish and diuide betweene faith and grace: for grace, to wit, hope and charity, may bee lost (say they) yet faith remaines. Whereas the true kinde of justifying faith is no lesse a gift of grace, then hope and charity is. And though they call their faith a liuing faith, when hope and charity doe accompanie it; yet of it selfe, and its owne nature it is not liuing; but hope and charitie are those liuing graces, for whose sake they call it a liuing faith. So that, for their faith to be liuing, is not of the nature or essence of it, nor is liuing the essentiall qualitie or propertie of their faith, but is made to depend vpon other causes, externallie, not naturallie inherent. *So as* their liuing faith is a meere figment. For how can one habite bee the forme of another? But *hope and charity are distinct habites*: and therefore are *not* *hope and charity* *of the forme or life of faith*. Yet this is that onely faith *of Rome*, which *Bellarmino* calls *Catholick, or Dogmaticall*. Onely hee saith *Catholici &c.* *see* *kes use not to call it historcall faith*, *lest they might me to imagine* (as indeede they doe not imagine) *that the Acts of the Saincts*, which are related in *Scripture*, are not belieued, but for the authority of the penman of the *History*. A pretty evasion. Nay the Pontificians are ashamed to name that faith, which alone they only avow & profess, namely the *Historicall*, which they guild ouer with *Catholick* forsooth, & *Dogmaticall*. As though *Historicall* were so called, as it respected the *Acts of the Saints* recorded in

Concil. Trid.  
Sess. 6. Can. 118.

Bellar. de Justif.  
lib. 1. c. 4.

D

the

( 20 )

the Scriptures, and not the whole history of the Scriptures; or as if it could not be *Historicall*, vntill it were grounded vpon the Authority of the Penmen themselues, and not of God himselfe the Author and Inspirer. So that M. Cholmley must know, if he will not bee a novice in the mysteries of Trent, that their distinguishing betweene *a dead and living faith*, is but a meete mocking, and tricke of legierde-maine.

Secondly, as the *Councell of Trent* denyeth the kinde of *Justifying faith*. So it accursteth the prime qualities & properties of it, as *Confidence* and *Affiance in Gods mercy*, as our *Church* hath defined. The Councils Canon is, *Si quis dixerit Fidem iustificantem nihil aliud esse quam fiduciam divine misericordia peccata remittentis propter Christum: vel eam fiduciam solam esse quam iustificamur, Anathema sit:* If any man shal say, that *justifying faith* is nothing els, but a *confidence* or *trust* in *Gods mercy*, forgiuing sinnes for *Christ*, or that *confidence* to be that only, whereby we are *justified*, let him be accursed. See for this also, chap. 9. of the same Session: where they vte *egregious hypocrisy* in excluding *confidence* <sup>of</sup> *faith*, as if it could not be without boasting; so as the *confidence* of *laung* <sup>th</sup> *of England* is found with *vaine boasting*. Thus the Churc<sup>h</sup> <sup>of</sup> *England* faid to bee accursed by the *Councell of Trent*, for holdyn<sup>g</sup> *a confidence and sure trust in Gods mercy*.

Can. 13. ibid.

To this they adde also another Canon discharged against *Certainty of saving faith*, as Can. 13. *Si quis dixerit omni homini ad remissionem peccatorum a sequendam necessarium esse, ut credat certo & absq<sup>u</sup> vlla hesitatione proprii infirmitatis & indispositionis, peccata sibi esse remissa: anathema sit.* That is, If any man shall say, that for the obtaining remission of sinnes it is necessary for euery man to beleue certainly, and without any doubting of his owne infirmity and disposition, that his sinnes are forgiuen: let him bee accursed. I haue put downe the Councils words intirely, and at length, lest M. Cholmley

out

out of his tender indulgence to preserue the Councells credit, might quarrell me for wronging the Councell, as hee elsewhere vnjustly doth.

Now although the wordes of the Councell be expresse enough, to shew they deny and accuse the onely *saving* faith: yet take Bellarmines Commentarie with it. Hec sayth, *Fidem iustificantem non esse fiduciam misericordie, sed solum assensum firmum ac certum ad ea omnia, quae Dens credenda proponit:* Iustifying faith is not a confidence in GODS mercy, but onely a firme and certaine assent to all those things, which GOD proposeth to bee beleued. And neare the end of the Chapter: *Fidem iustificare, quatenus per eam credimus ea, quae gignunt timorem, ac per hoc quatenus non est fiducia misericordie:* Faith iustifyeth, as by it wee beleue those things which breed feare, and therefore not as it is a confidence of GODS mercy. But of this sufficient. See my booke of Iustification.

In the third place, the Councell of Trent denyeth and accuseth the proper use and worke of saving faith in Iustification, which is to apply and appropriate the merites and righteousnesse of CHRIST to the soule and person of the beleeuuer, whereby hee is iustifyed in GODS sight. This is in part confessed by M Cholmley, onely hee speakest somewhat perplexedly, and indeede improperly and vnsoundly, in saying, *that faith iustifieth as the forme of iustification:* whereas faith iustifieth onely instrumentally, not formally. They deny also iustifying faith to bee a particular faith, and affiance, but that it is onely a generall assent. But the maine thing wherein he most iustifieth the Councell of Trent in this place is, that shee alloweth no other iustifying faith, but that which hath hope and loue ioyned with it, which we have alreadie refelled; nor this faith iustifying otherwise, but as Hope and Charitie, inherent graces: the onely formall iustification in the Church of Rome.

Only heere one thing I will adde to shew the vanitie of that assertion; and it is well worthie our obseruation: to wit, that though the Councell of Trent allow to their faith no place in iustification, but as it comes accompanied with hope and charity, their inherent righteousness: yet they so seeme to ascribe iustification to faith vnformed (as they call it) or before it come to bee ioyned with hope and charity, as by this meanes they quite ouerthrow and elude all those pregnant places of Scripture, which appropriate iustification to faith alone. Marke the Councels wordes in the eight Chapter of the Sixt Session: *Cum vero Apostolus dicit iustificari hominem per fidem gratis, ea verba in eo sensu intelligenda sunt, quem perpetuus Ecclesia Catholica consensus tenuit & expressit: ut scilicet per fidem, ideo iustificari dicamur, quia fides est humanae salutis initium, fundamentum, & radix omnis iustificationis, sine qua impossibile est placere DEO, & ad filiorum eius consortium pervenire, &c.* That is: And whereas the Apostle layth, A man is iustified by faith, and freely; these words are to bee vnderstood in that sense, which the perpetuall consent of the Catholike Church hath held and declared: to wit, that wee are saide to bee iustified by faith, because faith is the beginning of mans salvation, the foundation, and roote of all iustification, without which it is impossible to please GOD, and to come to the fellowship of his Sonne. To make this more cleare, let vs take *Andreas Vega* his Commentary, who himselfe was a great man in the Councell: who quarrelling those Diunes which helde iustifying faith so much commended in Scripture to bee onely the *living faith*, which in kinde is distinct from the *dead faith*: hee sayth thus: *Sed contra eos omnes quantilibet sunt autoritate, probatur nostra propositio. Primo, Et Paulus, & ceteri Apostoli, immo & ipse CHRISTVS, cum fidei tribuebant nostram salutem, & iustificationem, cum & eam exigeabant ab eis,*

quibus praedabant, agebant de fide, per quam acquirere possumus, & verè acquirimus iustitiam, docebantq; nos Dispositionem, qua nos ex parte nostra disponimur ad gratiam. Sed ista fides non est fides formata, aut saltem non in quantum formata habet ista efficere. Precedit enim saltem natura ipsam charitatem, qua formatur, sicut dispositio antecedit formam ad quam disponit. That is: But against them all, of what authority soever they bee, our Proposition is proued. First, both *Paul*, and the other Apostles, yea and *CHRIST* himselfe when they attributed our salvation and iustification to faith, when also they required it of those to whom they did preach, they spake of faith, by which wee may acquire, and doe truely acquire righ- teousnesse, and they taught vs that Disposition, whereby wee for our part dispose our selues to grace. But that faith is not the faith that is formed, or at least, not as it is formed doth it worke these things. For it goeth before (at least in order of nature) charity it selfe, whereby it is formed, as the Disposition goes before the forme to which it disposeth.

To this purpose the learned *Chemnitius* hath well de- Exam. Trid.  
tected the Councells fraud herein (as indeede like the ratt Concil. de fide  
it bewrayes it selfe with its owne voyce) *Quod scilicet*  
*ratione Preparationis fides intelligenda sit iustificare*: That is, Iustif.  
in regard of Preparation our faith is to bee vnderstood to  
justifie. And heereupon hee al adgeth *Can. 12.* & *cap. 8.* & *cap. 6.* And withall *Andradine* his exposition of  
the Councell. *Dicitur, Iustificandi vim fidei in sacris li-*  
*teris ideo tribus, quia animus ad accipiendam iustitiam*  
*praparet, premuniat, et prafultiat*: For hee sayth,  
That, therefore is the Force of Iustification attribu-  
ted to faith in the Scriptures, because it prepares,  
fitts, and makes way for the soule to receiue righ-  
teousnesse. *Et illud mox, &c.* And thus (sayth *Chem-*  
*nitius*) hee by and by expiicates more clearly  
D 3 *bus gaudiis in*

in these words: *Impius fidei justificari dicitur, quia fides initium & fundamentum est iustificationis hac ratione, quia fores quodammodo aperit ad spem, & charitatem, que opera sunt ad comparandam & consequendam iustitiam necessaria:* A sinner is sayd to bee justified by faith, because faith is the beginning and foundation of justification in this regard, because it doth after a sort open the dores to hope and charity, which workes are necessary to the procuring and obtaining of righteousness. So *Andradius*. By this time I hope M. *Cholmley* beginnes to see his owne errour, and grosse mistaking of the Councell of *Trent*, and repents him of the vnjust reproches wherewith hee hath so loaden his brother, and will acknowledge my argument to stand firme and vnanswerable, vnlesse hee will deny the conclusion.

For his, Secondly, pag. 17. &c. this is but a repetition of that hee said before, pag. 15. 16. which wee haue fully answered; and I am loth *bis in eundem lapidem impingere*, as the Prouerbe is, to fall vnder his checke any more for repetitions. Yet least hee should haue the least starting hole left him, and because some new thing is inserted withall, wee will repeate his wordes, and the reply to them.

‘ Secondly. (sayth hee) say the Councell had done so indeed: doth the whole Church of Rome do it? doth the popular part thereof do it? By your owne words, pag. 25. they deny it, yea but they beleue as the Church beleues. True, but with a secret condition, if the Church beleue well, and in that onely, wherein it beleueth a right: being deceiued in nothing, but that they trust the Church too much; for if they could bee perswaded shee beleueth amisse in any thing, therein they would not beleue as she doth &c.

I hope (as I sayd) M. *Cholmeley*, you your selfe will say, the Councell hath done so indeed, to wit, denied and accusid the saving and justifying faith. But doth the whole

Church

*Church of Rome do it? The whole Clergy doth it. But, doth the popular part do it? why not? what should lette them to bee as blinde and bad as, their guides? By your owne words (say you) pag. 25. they deny it. M. Cholmley, by this time I cease to wonder at your vnlimitted liberty, to speake what you list. It is all one with you to auouch vntreuths, for the Councell of Trent, and against your Christian brother. Every reader of my booke will tell you soe. Yea but they beleue as the Church beleue. True, but with a secret condition, if the Church beleue well. O M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley, I cannot but pitty you to see you so farre spent, and driuen to such poore shifts. I am sorry you shew your selfe so ridiculous to every common reader. Suppose the poore blind people in their beliefe hath such a secret condition. What then? But doth not that Church lay her heauy curse vpon all those, that shall beleue otherwise, then shee hath in her Councell of Trent decreed? But you confesse at length, that the people are *deceived in nothing but that they trust in the Church too much*, and so are perswaded shee beleueth amisse in nothing. What hope then is left for that poore seduced people? And if any of that blind people come to beleue otherwise then that Church teacheth them, to wit, sauinely, whence have they that beliefe, M Cholmley? From the Church of Roine? Or by extraordinary revelation? Surely not by the ordinary meanes allowed in that Church. And this comes home to my stating of the question, as before. But we proceede.*

‘ But you will proue that Romes iustifying faith is dif- M. Cholmley  
‘ ferent in kind from the true sauing faith of Christ. How? p.18.

‘ Can you tell? Mary thus.

‘ That faith which Christ commendeth for the only true  
‘ sauing faith, doth so iustify a man, that he shall never come  
‘ into condemnation, but passe from death vnto life.

But

But the only faith which the Church of Rome alloweth, doth not so. *Ergo*

I answere; A Papist or Arminian would deny the Proposition: but I grant it, and deny the Assumption: for let the Church of Rome confess what she wil in her own wrong: I say, that faith which the Church of Rome only alloweth for Iustification, (viz: a liuing faith, fruitfull in good workes) doth so saue & iustifie a man, that he cannot goe with it into condemnation: and dare you say the contrary?

*Reply.*

Yes, I dare, I haue sayd, and sufficiently proued the contrary, which M *Cholmley* ( I suppose) from henceforth will not dare not deny, what Papists or Armenians would doe, I know well; they would do more, then ( God bee thanked) they canne: but I am glad you quit your selfe so fairely from being a Papist or Arminian, in granting the Proposition. But you deny the Assumption. But wee haue already proued it, and so, as it is put past your denyall: yet you seeme to confess, that the Church of *Rome* hath confessed to her owne wrong, namely, that with her justifying faith she may goe to hell. So shee hath indeed confessed, whether to her owne wrong, or no, that I leaue to you, her justifier, and Advocate: but I am sure to her owne iust condemnation. But you say that *Romes* faith, which shee alloweth to iustification doth so saue and iustifie a man, that bee cannot goe wth it into condemnation. How dare a Minister of the Church of England, say this, when *Rome* expressly sayth the contrary? see Councell. Trid. Sess. 6. cap. 15. Not onely infidels, but the faithfull, as fornicators, adulterers, are excluded from the kingdome of heauen. Those which *Rome* calls faithfull, hauing still faith, yet perish with it. But you say, that *Romes* iustifying faith doth so saue & iustifie a man, that he cannot goe with it into condemnation. How? For their iustifying faith ( say you) is a liuing faith, fruitfull in good workes. But wee haue already proued, and you in part confessed, that the Church of *Rome* holds not her

Concil. Trid.  
Sess. 6. cap. 15.

her selfe justified by this faith, but rather by hope and charity, as they are graces inherent. And doe you hold, with the Councell of Trent, that wee are justified before God by grace inherent? If yee doe not, you must confesse, that their faith doth not at all justifie them, but as a preparatiue or dispositiue to justification, as they hold. But if you doe hold, that a man is justified, so as the Church of Rome holdeth, how can you excuse your selfe from being a ranke papist, a rotten hereticke, (if you persist) and an apostata Minister of the Church of England? yet this you are not affraid, not ashamed to affirme.

But proceede we:

The second Argument is this:

'That Church which cleaueth to Antichrist as her Head, whence shee receiveth all her spirituall life, is no true Church, nor hath any salvation to be found or hoped for in her:

'But the Church of Rome doth so: *Ergo.*

*M. Cholm-*

'I deny the Assumption; not for that I deny the Pope to bee Antichrist, or for that I woulde support the Church of Rome in any of her abominations: but first, because the Church of Rome doth not acknowledge the Pope to bee Antichrist, and so cleaneth not to him as Head in that name: Secondly, because, although some Popes haue Antchristianly saide, that all spirituall grace and life is derived from the Pope, and that some of their Parasites haue flatteringly acknowledged it, yet neither the representatiue Church of Rome by it selfe, nor the popular by it selfe, much lesse the whole and intire body, did ever yeeld vnto it, but haue from time to time opposed themselues against it, especially, of the question be of an absolute, Soveraigne, & supreme Head, & not of a subordinate and Ministeriall Head, as you propound it. Thirdly, because in these spirituall thinges there is such a conjunction of good & evill in this life,

E

that

that though the one cannot be separated from the other,  
 yet the one is not confounded with the other; so as each  
 of them receiues its life severally from its owne head, &  
 not from the head of the other: As it is in the regenerate  
 man, in whom the faith and the spirit are alwayes com-  
 panions in this life; yet so, as the flesh receiueth nothing  
 from the Holy Ghost, nor the spirit from *Adams* trans-  
 gression. And so it is in the case wee haue in hand. For in  
 the Church of Rome, there is an inseparable conjunction  
 of Babylon and the people of God, yet so as Babylon re-  
 ceiues no grace from Christ, nor the people of God Apo-  
 stacie from the Pope, for being members of both in di-  
 verse respects, they haue grace from the one, and Aposta-  
 cie from the other, which in them are indeed nothing,  
 but flesh and spirit: And so much for his second Argu-  
 ment.

*Reply.*

You deny the Assumption, but withall excuse your selfe,  
 as not denying the Pope to be Antichrist, or that ye would  
 support the Church of Rome in any of her abominations.  
 But you haue done too much already; but belike it is a-  
 gainst your will: I will in charity believe it, when you  
 publickly recant it. But first you say, *the Church of Rome*  
*doth not acknowledge the Pope to bee Antichrist;* And hath  
 shee not reason? *nor cleaueth to him as her head:* In that  
 name true; but shee cleaueth to him as her head: and you  
 deny him not to be *Antichrist*: therefore shee cleaueth to  
 Antichrist as her head. The Argument runneth thus:

The Pope is Antichrist,

The Pope is Head of the Church of Rome:

*Ergo*, Antichrist is Head of the Church of Rome.

But is this a good reason, to say, *The Church of Rome*  
*doth not acknowledge the Pope to bee Antichrist:* therefore  
*shee doth not cleave to him as her head in that name;* you  
 might as well argue thus: *The Church of Rome doth not ac-  
 knowledge*

knowledge the Images to bee Idols: therefore shee doth not in worshiping Images, worship Idols. Or thus, *The Church of Rome doth not acknowledge the body of Christ, which they say is really, or rather carnally present in their Host, to be an Idol: ergo, shee doth not worship an Idol.* But suffice it, that the Church of Rome acknowledgeth the Pope in all those titles by him assumed, whereby the Scriptures manifest him to bee that Antichrist: So that in the thing, though not in the name, Antichrist is acknowledged to bee the Head. Hee exalts himselfe aboue all that is called God, he sits in, or ouer, or for the Temple of God, exercising diuine and plenary vnlimited authority ouer all (the note and nature of Antichrist;) the Church of Rome wholly acknowledgeth the Pope the Head, as rightly invested in those titles and Soveraignety: *Ergo, in effect they acknowledge him to bee Antichrist, as in name their Head.*

Secondly it is not only assumed by Popes themselues, *Se Sexti, de E-*  
*nor onely ascribed to them by their Paralites, but it also* *le& dione tit. 6.*  
*stands decreed & ratified in their Decretals, that the Pope* *Fundamenta.*  
*is one and the same Head with Christ, and from the Pope* *One of Nizol.*  
*all spiritual life doth flow, as frō the Head into all the me-*3. his Pontificall* de-*decrees irretra-**  
*bers: & these Decretals are imposed, & received as equall gabs. &c.*

in authority with the Diuine Scriptures. Againe, it is vndeniable; that the whole Church of Rome at this day doth acknowledge the Pope, for no other head, but an absolute, Soveraigne, Supreme: For the Scepter of Christ, whereby hee swayes and governes his Church, is his word: but this word the Pope hath assumed into his owne power, to giue sense and authority vnto it, as him pleaseth, so as the Spirit of the word must bee no other, but the Spirit of the Pope, from whom the Church of Rome must not appeale to Christ and his Spirit, ruling in, and by the Scriptures. Tell me, M *Cholmeley*, doth, or dare any in and of the Church of Rome at this day appeale from the Church, or Pope, to the Scriptures, for decision of any point of faith?

How then doe they acknowledge the Pope only for a subordinate and Ministeriall Head? Or how, or wherein doe they ascribe any prerogatiue to Christ aboue the Pope in matters of faith? Nay, doe they not say, that Christ and the Pope haue one consistory. But some Parasites say so. No doubt Pope Nichol. 3. hath decreed it irrefragably, that Peter was assumed into the fellowship of the individuall vniuersitie, to be one with Christ, to wit, one Head, one foundation of the Church. *vt supra. sexti. ibid.* And when the old pie so chattereth, will not M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley allow a whole nest full of parasites to make the like, as Annons birdes, which himselfe taught to sing, *Annon est Deus. Elian. lib. 14. cap. 3.* Nay is not Christ and his Spirit, together with the scepter of his word, quite excluded from their Magisteriall office, while the Pope vsurpes their whole authority ypon himselfe alone?

Thirdly, your comparison of flesh and Spirit in the regenerate man, how impertinent and absurd it is, every one may judge: For, as these two are not separate, so (say you) in the Church of Rome there is an inseparable conjunction of Babylon and the people of God. So? How then shall Gods people obey Christs voyce, saying, *Come out of Babylon, my people,* if their conjunction with Babylon bee inseparable? Or how can any members of the Pope, not receive Apostacie from him? For if the head fall into a pit, what becomes of the body, trow you, while it is inseparably conjoyned vnto it? Reade *Revel. 14. 9. 10. 11.* Or can the same people receive grace from Christ, and Apostacie from Antichrist? For *by grace we stand,* but by Apostacy men fall away. And how can M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley teach vs by any distinction to beleue, that the same people, at the same time, in the same estate, may both stand by grace, and fall away by apostacy? How can these two ~~accord~~, and contradicories stand together? *Flesh and Spirit* are compatible in the *Regenerate*: but not so *Grace and Apostacy*. Besides, it behoues M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley first to proue

proue that there is an inseparable conjunction betweene Gods people and Babylon; or that any of the members of Babylon, or of the Pope, the Antichrist, are Gods people, indued with grace. For wee haue already proued, that the councell of Trent hath destroyed and denyed the saving faith of Christ in Babylon, without which, and the preaching thereof, how can any become Gods people?

Proceede wee:

*The third Argument:*

*A true visible Church hath the true markes of a true visible Church:* M. Cholmeley, pag. 21.

*But the Church of Rome hath not those true markes:*  
*Ergo. The Assumption is to be denied, which he proueth partly from the doctrine of the Church of England, partly from Bellarmine.*

*Reply.*

Now M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley, what say you to the doctrine of the Church of England? you answere, these wordes must receive a favourable construction, or else they make as much against him, as against vs; and with such construction they make more for vs, then for him. How, M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley? first, they must be understood of the accidentall trueth, in regard of soundnesse, (as the wordes doe expressely import) and not of essentiall trueth, in regard of Gods covenant. Stay there, Accidentall truth? Is the pure and sound doctrine of Gods word Accidentall truth? An Accident, we know, may be separated from the Subject, without the destruction of the Subject. But can a true Church subsist without the sound doctrine of Gods word? No, saith our Church. Or is sound doctrine an Accident, but inseparable? How then comes it to be separated from the Church of Rome, as our Church affirmeth? Or is not the sound doctrine of Gods word essentiall truth? And is it not the word of Gods Covenant? yea is it not the Testament of Christ? How then doth M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley limit it to Accidentall only,

M. Cholm- and not allow it to bee essentiall? But hee hath a second an-  
ley. pag. 22. swere: Secondly they must bee understood even of sound-  
nesse comparatiuely, and not simply, that is, in regard of the  
Primitive Church, and not otherwise: Else hee must grant,  
that the Church of Rome hath not beeene a true visible Church  
these nine hundred yeares: whereas he allowes it to haue beeene  
so, till the Councell of Trent, as appeareth in all this discourse.  
How? Comparatiuely in regard of the Primitive Church,  
and not otherwise? Nay, simply, say I, in regard of the Pa-  
pacy, and not otherwise. For to that haue the words in the  
homily reference onely, saying, that for fault of the true  
markes, it had not beeene a true Church, for the space of  
nine hundred yeares past, to that time. Where the Homily  
alludes to the first Pope, who usurped the name and title  
of *Universall Head of the Church, Boniface the third*; at him  
began the Papacy, and so Antichristian Apostacie of the  
Church of Rome, which had continued and growne about  
nine hundred yeares, when the Homily was compiled. From  
that time it was, that preaching began more notoriously  
to be adulterated, and the Sacraments by degrees sophisti-  
cated, and the Discipline of the Church corrupted. But by  
this reason you would inferre, that the Church of Rome  
should then haue beeene no true Church this nine hundred  
yeares now, and voward, which ( you say ) wee grant.  
Where doe I say in all my discourse, or in any part of it,  
*that the papacy was a true Church, till the Councell of Trent?*  
No, I say, till the Councell of Trent, there was a true  
Church in the Papacy: But now I say, vpon and since the  
Councell of Trent, the whole Church of Rome, roote &  
branch, head and taile, is wholly transformed into the  
Papacie. The soule of the Papacie is *tota in toto, & tota*  
*in qualibet parte*, is whole in the whole, and whole in euery  
part, and member of that Papall body.

M. Cholme- Now for Bellarmine, I am sorry such a superficiall Reader  
ley. should meddle with him, to the shame of our whole nation.

Reply.

## Reply.

M Cholmeley, if downeright rayling, and vnlimited reproching of your brother, were not the strongest Argu-  
ment, that you haue brought as yet, or can bring for the defence of your wretched caules wee could haue wished, that for the honour of God, for the peace of your Mother Church, for brotherly charity sake, for your owne credit, and for the reputation of him, whom you specially labour so to vindicate, you had beene altogether silent.

But shew vs your profoundnesse, M Cholmeley, in your reading of Bellarmine. Haue I not noted him right? But you deny this to be a good consequence: Bellarmine dis-  
claims these 3 notes of the Church, as proper markes of the Church of Rome: Ergo, the Church of Rome hath them not. But the Church of England denies them to the Church of Rome: Bellarmine confesseth it; and ( this being true ) is this no good consequence? where is your Logick now? But say you, may not a man disclaime that which he hath, for some sinister respect best knowne to himselfe? as pride and presumption in meddling in causes, and with persons too high for him, and the like? And why might not M Cholmeley say as well, May not a man disclaime himselfe to be a freind of Babylon, even while he stoutly pleads for her, for some sinister respects best knowne to himselfe, there being more to be got ( one way ) for defending of some mens reputation, then for the honour of Christ, and of his Church? But say, that either Bellarmine, or the Church of Rome her self did arrogate these 3 markes to themselves: were it therefore a good consequence, Ergo, the Church of Rome is a true visible Church, notwithstanding the Church of England say the contrary?

Secondly, ( saith M Cholmeley ) doth Bellarmine dis-  
claime them simply, and not onely in comparison of meere proper markes? All your distinctions will not serue the  
turne,

turne, to proue, that the Church of Rome hath these 3 markes, either simply, or cōparatiuely: our Church simply denieth them to the Church of Rome: & will you stand in comparison against your Mother? And it sufficeth, that *Bellarmino* denies these to bee proper markes; and our Church sets them downe for proper markes, whereby to know all true Churches.

Thirdly ( say you) *May not the Church of Rome bane them as markes common to all Churches, true and false, though not as proper to the true Church?* But the Church of England tels you againe and againe, that the Church of Rome hath not these markes no way: Againe, are these markes common to all Churches, true and false? How then doe these markes distinguish the true Church, from the false? Or, are not these the proper markes of the true Church? I looked at length for some solider reasons, and not for such poore sophismes, and pittifull nonsenses.

M. Cholmley

Fourthly, (say you) doth not *Bellarmino de Ecclesia*, lib. 3. cap. 2. *Nostra autem sententia* ( contradicting himselfe) put these three into the definition of the Church? and doth hee not by them distinguish the Church from all other sortes of men whatsoeuer? *Professione vera fidei, sacramentorum communione, subiectione ad proprium Pastorem?*

### Reply

In this allegation of M. Cholmley out of *Bellarmino*, note (good Reader) first his falsification, in setting downe *Bellarmino* words, which (according to *Bellarmino*) are, *Professio vera fidei, Sacramentorum communio, & subiectio ad legitimum Pastorem Romanum Pontificem*: that is, Profession of the true faith, communion of Sacraents, and subjection to the lawfull Pastor the Bishop of Rome. Secondly,

condly note his false explication and application of these 3. as equiualent to those, which our Church sets downe for workes of the true Church, and denies them to bee in the Church of Rome.

The Church of Englands markes:

- 1 Pure and sound doctrine.
- 2 The Sacraments ministred according to Christ's holy institution.
- 3 The right use of Ecclesiastical Discipline.

The Church of Romes Markes.

- 1 Profession of the true faith.
- 2 Communion of Sacraments.
- 3 Subjection to the lawfull Pastor, the Bishop of Rome.

Now doth M. Cholmeley put no more difference betwene pure and sound doctrine; and the bare Profession of the true faith betwene the Sacraments ministred according to Christ's holy institution, and the Communion of the Sacraments? betwene the right use of Ecclesiastical Discipline; and subjection to the Lawfull Pastor, the Bishop of Rome? No, no more. For whereas Bellarmine *de Notis Ecclesiae*, disclames those three notes, alleged by the Church of England: here, (sayth M. Cholmley) he contradicth himselfe; confessing those three notes to be in the Church of Rome; and yet they are no other, but as wee haue seene. M. Cholmley must pardon me, that I am so bold with him to detect his manner of dealing in defending Bellarmine, and the Church of Rome; for else I might deserue that aspersion, which hee hath so pereimporily, proudly, and past all shame cast vpon mee, and which I must craue leaue to retutne, where it is most due, and there leaue it: *I am sorry* such a superficiall Reader shoulde meddle with Bellarmine to the shame of our whole Nation.

Fistly, is it not a Maxime of Bellarmine, *lib. 1. de sacram.* M. Cholmley in genere, cap. 26. *Respondeo, Sacramenta, That the Sacraments, and the word of God, and the rest, Solius*

Pag. 22.

*semper*

*Semper esse Ecclesia, etiam si interdum extra Ecclesiam inveniatur?* What dealing then is this, to play the sophister so palpably, *à dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter?* This is his third Argument.

*Reply.*

*Bellarmino* in the fore alleged place sayth, that the sacraments are alwaies proper to the Church, although sometimes they be found without the Church. But I know not what *M. Cholmley* can conclude from hence, vnlesse by adding this clause to the former, hee would inferre, that the Church of Rome is the onely Church (for so *Bellarmino* makes it) and that consequently the Church of England, which doth not acknowledge the Pope for her lawfull Pastor, hath no right to the word and Sacraents, and the rest as being proper and peculiar to the one and onely Church of Rome, out of which the Church of England (blessed bee God) is. Hee might thanke his distinction, so frequent with him, *à dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*, the better bestowed in this place, if it could saue him harmelesse from the rebutting of his owne dart vpon himselfe; what dealing is this, to play the Sophister so palpably?

*M. Cholmley. pag. 24.* The fourth you shall find pag. 35. to this purpose. If the Church of Rome cannot demonstrate it selfe to bee a true Church, then it is no true Church:

But it cannot: Ergo.

*Reply.*

Stay: before we passe further let vs examine, if any such Argument bee to bee found, or may bee formed from the quoted place of my 7 vials, pag. 35. Indeed there are these words: *If the Church of Rome then cannot demonstrate it selfe to be a true Church ( and no maruaile sith it wants the right demonstratiue markes) why should we take the paines, on be so officious as to pin a true visible Church vpon her sleeve?*

This

This is that I say. From whence M. Cholmley might haue  
tramed this Argument.

If the Church of Rome cannot demonstrate it selfe to  
be a true Church, then it ill becomes M. Cholmley or any  
Minister of the Church of England to plead Babes cause,  
and to go about to proue her a true Church:

But the Church of Rome cannot do it: Ergo.

But other inference M. Cholmley cannot (without vio-  
lence) make of my words, that because the Church of Rome  
cannot demonstrate her selfe a true Church, therefore there is  
no true Church. This argument then being of M. Cholmleys  
owne devising, & not mine, I envy him not the injoying of  
his answere without other confutation.

Onely whereas he quarrels me againe (pag. 25,) as dea-  
ling vnruly with Bellarmine, (whom hee is so curious  
and punctuall to defend in all points) he not hauing, *Only*;  
let me also set downe Bellarmines words; who speaking of  
his 15 markes, saith, *Non quidem efficiunt evidenter verum, ipsam esse veram Dei Ecclesiam, sed tamen efficiunt id evi-  
denter credibile.* These 15 notes do not indeede make it evi-  
dently true, that it is the true Church of God, but yet they  
make it evidently credible. Here then let the Reader  
judge, what wrong I haue done Bellarmine by, *Only*; the  
sense being equivalent and the same, as I haue briefly  
rendred it. And againe he sayth, *Dicimus ergo, Notas Ec-  
clesie, quas adferemus, non facere evidentiam veritatis sim-  
pliciter, &c. Sed tamen efficiunt evidentiam credibilitatis;*  
Wee say then, that the notes of the Church, which wee  
will bring, doth not make evidence of the trueth simply  
&c: but yet they make evidence of credibility. But where-  
as M. Cholmley would inferre, the evidence credible, to Pa-  
gans; but the evidently true, as well as evidently credible, to  
Christians: there is no such thing expressed in Bellarmine,  
of making evidently credible to Pagans: and, for evidently  
true to Christians, it is in respect of their admitting of di-  
vine Scriptures, and histories, and the writings of ancient

Bellar.de Nost  
Eccl., cap. 3.

Fathers. Thus the Reader may see the humor of M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley, how quarrelous towards his brother, how zealous for Bellarmine, adding some thing more, pag. 26; but I will not trouble you with every trifle.

He proceeds in pag. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, beating the ayre about Popish *Invention*, and my braines going about to teach me this point, what difference there is among Pontificians about it. I leaue him to reconcile them. Onely I will here set downe the Canon of the Councell of Trent, for confirmation of what I haue sayd : *Si quis dixerit in*

*Secl. 7. can. 11. Ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt, & conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi, quod facit Ecclesia: anathema sit: If any say, that in the Ministers, while they consecrate, and conferre the Sacraments, is not required an Intention at least of doing, what the Church doth: let him be accursed.* I could wish M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley had read their commentaries vpon this Canon: *Vega* shewes it at large in his Trent-Commentary: where among many other instances he hath this, out of *Gabriel Biel*, *Non posse quenquam &c.*

*A Vega lib. 9.  
de incertitudi-  
ne gratiæ cap.  
15.*

That no man can be certaine of his justification, although it might suffice not to put a barre, that wee might obtaine grace by the Sacrament of penance, because the Intention of the Absoluer cannot be evident to any, And *ibid. cap. 17, Quinto*: Fiftly, the most safe and certaine way giuen vs to justification, are the Sacraments. But it canne appeare to none by faith, that he hath receiued euен the least Sacrament. And this is so certaine to bee beleued, as its cleare that we liue. *Nulla quippe est via &c.* For there is no way, by which, without Revelation wee can know the intention of the Minister, either evidently or certaintly by faith. And this *Vega* there groundeth vpon the foresayd Canon of *Trent*. Read also the learned *Chennitius*, in his second part, *of intention*; where hee sheweth that the Trent Canon of the Priests *Intention*, ouerthroweth all faith, and therefore of no small moment, howsoeuer M.

*Cholmley*

Cholmley make light of it, and labours to qualifie and excuse it.

And after *Intention*, hee comes to *Certainty*; where hee seemeth to bee acquainted with *Vega*, and other Schoole *Dissines*, in that he shakes hands with them in the point of morall and conjecturall certainty. Now surely, how it fareth with M. Cholmley, I know not, but for my part I see not, why any man, not onely a Minister, but any sensible or reasonable man should without blushing, lay or joyne these two together, *Coniecturall certainty*. And yet this is all that *certainty*, which M. Cholmley can bring, to proue, that all and euery Papist may demonstrate himselfe to haue receiued true baptisme, as being *conjecturally certaine* both that hee was baptizied, and of the *Priests intention*. And besides, hee addeth, that it is twenty to one, but one Papist or other hath a *Reuelation of the Priests Intention*. But one swallow makes not the spring: nor can one M. Cholmley, make any one Papist more then *coniecturally certaine* of his Baptisme, vnlesse he can borrow, or bring some clearer revelation for it, then yet wee see.

Pag. 29.

The last Argument pag. 31. is this,

That Church which wants the ordinary meanes of Saluation, is not true Church.

M. Cholm-

But the Church of Rome wants the Ordinary meanes *ley. pag. 31.* of saluation, the preaching and hearing of the Gospell, yea it teacheth hers to hate and abhorre it, and to call it heresy. Ergo. I answere, they want it, and they want it not; they hate it, and they hate it not: they want & hate the soundnes & purity thereof, as it is enjoyed in the reformed Churches: but they neither want nor hate it, as it is corrupted by their own Traditions, which cannot wholly deprive it of all sauing vertue. And why (I pray) should we not be content in common commiseration to beare with the in this case; as wee do with those people, which dwell in fenny,

F 3 foggy,

foggy and marshy grounds, and Countries, who comming  
 into places of fresh aire, and healthy diet, do complaine,  
 that it is not good nor wholesome, because it agrees not  
 with their more grosse constitution? If another man liue  
 by poysoned meates, I will not envy him, so long as I  
 feed on that which is sound and mans meate (as we say.)  
 And so much for his Arguments.

Reply.

Wee see, how M. Cholmleys answers are drawne so dry,  
 that he is come to the last lees and dregges of flatte contra-  
 dictions. Nor do I know whether it may stand with my  
 credit to make any reply to this last answere, it being no  
 lesse ridiculous, then the rest fabulous. *They want it, and  
 they want it not: they hate it, and they hate it not.* How? *They  
 want and hate the soundnesse and purity thereof.* This is e-  
 nough. If they want and hate this, they want and hate all  
 that is good. *But they neither want nor hate it, as it is corrup-  
 ted by their owne Traditions, which cannot wholly deprive it  
 of all savinge vertue as hath beeene already proued.* Yes  
 M. Cholmley, for as it is thus corrupted, they want it,  
 sith their corruptions are preferred before and aboue it.  
 Nor doe they loue it for any other respect, (if for any at  
 all) but because it is corrupted. They loue it not then for it  
 selfes sake, but for the corruptions sake. So that if you can  
 bring no better proofes, then hitherto; you will draw our  
 commiseration vpon your selfe, which wee deny not also  
 to the Church of Rome. But because we commiserate her,  
 shall it not be a foolish pitty, to delude our selues in allow-  
 ing her a true Church, which (you confess) both wants  
 and hates soundnesse of doctrine? your fenny and foggy  
 comparison, and that of poysoned meates, wee leauue, as  
 best agreeable to popish constitutions, who cannot brooke  
 the pure ayre and wholesome food of Gods word: hoping,  
 that the purer ayre and diet of your Portion of Clare, will  
 in time purge out the poyson, which you haue sipp'd  
 from

from the Babylonish cup.

Thus haue I shewed M. Burtons second point of Disorder M. Cholmley misplacing his Arguments; and haue, as well as I can, righted. pag. 32. ed it, and answered them.

Reply.

Howsoeuer I haue misplaced my Arguments, sure I am you haue misapplyed your answeres, as every judicious Reader will witnesse. So that all the right you haue done me, is this, that your answeres haue left my Arguments as intire and full, as you found them, and haue now prouoked me the more to confirme them, by convincing and confuting your more then absurd answeres: wherein that I must craue any pardon, it is, for filling my fingers with such vneworthie stiffe.

The third and last followes, which are his idle Repetitions, and tautologies, &c. Now here I must craue fauour M. Cholmley. of the Christian Reader, that (being constrained by the misbehauiour of our Adversary, to lay open his foule ouersights, in charging the Church of Rome, the Council of Trent, and Bellarmine with vntruthe, which hee ought not to haue done) he would not suppose me to bee any whit inclined or addicted to Popery, as the manner of the world is now a dayes. No, I praise God, I am as farre from Popery, as M<sup>r</sup> Burton himselfe is, or canne bee. &c.

Reply.

But M. Cholmley shewes not those idle Repetitions, or tautologies, or at least hee proceedes not to confute them: which if hee doe, will not his answers trouw you proue idle Repetitions and tautologies. But these hee will impute to mine. And why may not I as well impute my repetitions, if any, to the occasion giuen mee? But as for your suit to the Christian Reader, M. Cholmley you must know that a Diuine of the Church of England, pleading for the Church

Church of *Rome*, and playing her Advocate, as you haue done must not expect that priuiledge, which many Advocates or Pleaders take to themselues in Westmister Hall, who when they haue pleaded stoutly for a bad cause, for which they haue the bigger fee, would yet bee accounted for as honest men, as they bee learned Lawyers. But it is *the manner of the world now adayes to misdeeme such as you are, as inclining or addicted, somewhat at least to Popery.* And can you blame it, when it is the manner of the world now adayes, that Ministers of the Church of England are so forward to take vp the bucklers for the Church of *Rome*? Instead therefore of praising God for your innocencie in this point, I could wish you to pray vnto him to pardon you this scandall, which you haue brought vpon your Mother Church, thereby giuing iust occasion to all that know and loue to account you as one inclining and addicted more then somewhat to *Popery*. So that if you were as farre from *Popery*, as M. *Burton*, you would never haue put pen to paper to paint and decke that strumpet, which M. *Burton* (he blesseth God) never yet did.

*But you haue beene hitherto constrained by the misbehaviour of your adversary, to lay open his foule ouerights.* This is belike that misbehaviour mentioned in your Epistle Dedicatory. Well, you haue beene constrained. And surely I easly beleue, you would not willingly (see the mishap of it) instead of laying open your Aduersaries foule ouerights, haue so palpably discouered to all the world your profound ignorance, (if not impiety) in so defending the Councell of Trent, Bellarmine &c. Do not then, do not, henceforth maintaine bad causes for the Church of *Rome*, wherin you haue verified your ewne words, to maintaine bad causes with worse arguments. What we haue defended against her, it is not M. Cholmleyes 7 dayes, no nor 7 yeares Defence can ouerthrow it. And where you say, *It is an excellent point of manhood, to let the enemy haue his vtmost due, and not to seeke to overcome him by base and cowardly meanes:*

meanes: O M. Cholm. when you first advanced your crest as a champion for the Church of Rome, did you not think that you were to deale with an Adversary bound hand and foote, to whom it should not be easie to vse his weapon in open field against you? if so, where is your manhood to vse such base & cowardly meanes, as calumniations and vilifications of your brother, all along, who in this cause desires nothing but freedome and faire play, from the Marshalls of the field to cope with you. But if you purpose to do hereafter, as you haue done, and as you professe, surely the good Reader ( whom you againe sollicite ) will not bee pleased to beleue you; as being an vnreasonable motion; perceiving too well, that you haue both abused him and your Adversary, yea and your Lord too ( whose cause you haue vndertaken ) and in fine your selfe in vndertaking it. But what enemy doe you meane, to whom we deny his vtmost due? The Church of Rome, because wee deny her to be a true Church? But that which is vndue giue mee leaue to deny to an enemy, who is ready to assume beyond all measure, more then is due vnto him: & for which cause Gods true Church shal one day strip that strūpet of all her stolne stufte. In the following page 34,35,36, the Reader finding nothing but meere cauils, I passe the ouer, as answered before. In pag. 37,38,39. M. Chol. bringeth a whole catalogue of Protestant Authors to sway the ballance on his side. But whence doth he take them: Not from his owne particular reading & obseruation, but in grosse, & by heapes, as they are billed vp by the Popish Authors, as Brierlie, & Smith; it is one thing what Popish Authors quote from Protestants, another what Protestants themselues acknowledge. Why should not M. Cholm. haue examined the truth concerning those authors, before he put them in his skale? My reaso is, because in many of those Authors by him billed, I haue by proofe in some, such as I haue at hand, found it to bee quite contrary, & so belōging to my skale. For instance: The Augustane Confession in the former Articles Disp. 8. de Eccles. 2. 11. sayth, *Quod Papæ Ecclesia sit malignantium Ecclesia*, item

*item regnum Antichristi:* That the Papall Church, or of the Pope, is the Church of the malignant, and the Kingdome of Antichrist. See also *Num. 12. & 13.* where it is laid in the yeare 1530, *Necessity was laide upon our publick Confessours, that in the theatre of the whole Christian Empire, they should clearly expresse their mind concerning this necessary Head of Christian doctrine, that all Christians might know, what was the true Head of the Church, and how the members are incorporated into the true Head of the true Church, and that they might learne to avoide counterfeit Heads, and altogether discerne which was the true, which the false Church.* So the Augustan confession. And in this was both *Luthers* opinion & many more, both contained, & expressly mentioned: Here-

\* As the Helve-  
tian, 1 & 2 Ba-  
sil. Bohemian,  
French, En-  
glish, Belgick,  
Augustan,  
Saxon, Witem-  
berg, Sweue.

unto we might add the \* *Harmony of Confessions*, wherein in effect, eleuen severall confessions of so many Protestant Churches, wherof this of *England* is one, shew the Church of Rome to be no true Church. All which alone, were sufficient to counterpoyle M *Cholmleyes* skale. But examine we some few more of his Authors ailedged by his *Brierly* & *Smith*, a little more to ease and highten his skale, M *Hooker* saith plainly, that in the point of *Iustificatiō* (which is the fundamental doctrine of saluation) the Church of Rome ouerthroweth the foundation, & extinguisheth the force of the blood of Iesus Christ. How then is it a true Church?

\* *Controv. 2.*  
quæst. 6. cap. 1.

D<sup>r</sup> *Whitaker* handling this question punctually: *An Ecclesia Romana sit vera Ecclesia Christi visibilis*, whether the Church of Rome be a true visible Church of Christ: in stating the question, saith thus: *Eam nos non modo non solum Catholicam, &c.* We say it is not only not the only Catholick, but not at all Catholick, nor only not Catholick, to wit, universall, but we contend, it is not a true particular Church of Christ. *Quare deserendam esse dicimus ab omnibus &c.* Wherefore we say, she ought to be forsakē of all men, who will be sauēd, as the Synagogue of Antichrist and Satan. And a little after, *It is not any Church at all, nor any saluation to be hoped from it, Nullam in ea salutem sperandam esse.* I set downe

downe Dr Whitakers owne wordes, because to M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley mine seeme Buggs wordes, and never heard or vttered before, causing M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley to tremble, as hee sayth, when we say that *no salvation is to bee found in her the Church of Rome*. But by that time that M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley hath in speciall perused with these I haue named, all the rest mentioned in grosse by him, taken vp vpon trust from Popish Authors, I trust hee will grow so well inured with this opinion and speech, as he will not be afraide to take it vp, and be of the same minde too. Then shall he know and acknowledge, that M<sup>r</sup> Burton, is not the first that hath usurped this assertion, nor goes alone in it. The same Dr Whitakers, Cap. 3. goes on to proue this his Assertion, in regard of the Head of that Church, the Pope, whom he proueth to bee no true Bishop, as i being no true Teacher. 2 assuming the power of Vniverſall Bishop: 3 being the true Antichrist, and therefore that Church which adheres to him as Head, is Antichristian. And for the members, they are (sayth he) either the Cleargy, or the Laity: the Cleargy are either Bishops or Priests. These are like their Head, no true Bishops, &c. Whence this Argument: *Vbi nullum, &c.* Where there is no lawfull Ministry, there is no Church: But among the Papists is no lawfull Ministry, therfore among the Papists no Church. Then hee proues it from the people, as differing nothing from Turkes, and Pagans, and Iewes, but in the bare name of Christians. From the parts, hee descends to the whole Body, consisting of Head and Members, and prouesthe Church of Rome jointly to bee no Catholike, no Apostolike, not one, not a holy Church, as from the Councell of Constantinoples foure Notes. *For shee holdes not the Catholike Apostolike Faith, because shee hath not the pure preaching of the Word, and the right and lawfull administration of the Sacraments observed by the Apostles, and instituted of Christ. They overthrew the foundation, to wit, justification by faith, and many other foundations to the number of 18, set downe by Dr Whi-*

takers: therefore they cannot be saued, sayth he, persisting therein: *Ergo, nulla Ecclesia.* For M. Perkins, I referre the Reader to his Exposition vpon the Creed, the holy Catholike Church, the two last leaues, where hee proues the Church of Rome no true Church. His wordes are (stating the question, as we doe) *As for the assemblies of Papists, which haue beeene a great part of the world, if thereby wee understand companies of men holding the Pope for their Head, and beleeming the Councell of Trent, they are called Churches, but in deede they are no true, or sound members of the Catholick Church.* For both in the doctrine, and in the worship of God, they raze the very foundation of Religion, which will appeare by these Notes: as in the point of Iustification &c. King James calls the Church of Rome Babylon. P. Martyr, The Kingdome of Antichrist. D. Willet (though not heere billed) in his Synopsis, plainly sheweth, and that by many sound Argumentes, the Church of Rome to bee no true Church. See Willets Synopsis controv. a. of the church Where in the name of all Protestants, he sayth, quest. 5. part. 2

The Church of Rome is not a true visible Church.

### The Protestants:

Wee deny utterly, that they are a true visible Church of CHRIST, but an Antichristian Church, and an Assembly of Heretickes, and enemies to the Gospell of IESVS CHRIST. D. Carleton also, the late reverend Bishop of Chichester, in his learned booke *de Ecclesia* plainly proueth, and concludeth, that the Church of Rome hath no communien with the Catholike Church of CHRIST. But to confine my selfe to the Authors billed and catalogued by Brierly for M. Holmley, and that wee may not weary the Reader in setting downe every particular Authors Opinion, wee will close vp all with the verdict of the reverend D. Field, one of the Muster, who in an answere to Bellarmines objecting the confession of Protestants, to proue the Romane Synagogue (to vse D. Fields owne

owne words) to bee the true Church of God: in his 47 Chapter of the 3<sup>d</sup> Booke of the Church, the title whereof is, *Of the Protestants pretended confession, that the Romane Church is the true Church of God: hee sayth, Surely if Bellarmine can proue, that wee confess it to bee the true Church, he needeth not use any other arguments.* Let vs see therefore how he proueth, that wee confess the Romane Church to be the true Church of God. *Luther (sayth hee) clearelie yeeldeth it, and Calvin, and others in effect acknowledge the same.* This we deny &c. Reade the whole Chapter. This may suffice to answere M. Cholmleyes Bill of Protestants, among whō yet I muse he would ranke Vorstius, vnlesse it were to show the malice of the Popish alledgers, and not his owne good will to Vorstius, to giue him the honour to be set among so many Worthies. To conclude, the best prooфе, and all that M. Cholmley, or any other of his side, can produce from any Protestant Orthodox Diuines, is this, that God may haue a hidden Church in the Church of Rome, or in Babylon, whence they are bidden to flee. No man denyes this. But will or can any man hence conclude, that the Church of Rome is a true visible Church of Christ, because some liuing within the pale of that Synagogue, are of the number of Christ's secret ones? Then he may as well conclude, that because Gods Church is in the world, therefore the world wherein it is, is the true visible Church of God.

As for M. Cholmleyes scoffs & sarcasmes pag. 40, as if it were no perilous advantage at all giuen to the Papists, thus to defend them for a true Church; I leaue them to the censure of the wisest & best in our Church. *A perillous advantage, I promise you.* Is it not in good earnest, M. Cholmley, a perillous advantage, when your owne allegation whispers vnto vs, that Popish authors take advantage by billing vp so many Protestants, as you haue told vs of, as affirming the Church of Rome to be a true Church? Hath not the learned D. Field obserued it (as we haue noted) to be an Advantage, snatched at by Bellarmine himselfe?

Thus will they not be apt to say to you, if not, *Thy Mother Church of Rome*, yet at least, *Thy brother Benhadad*, or, *Thy sister Samaria*?

M. Ch. p. 40 But you adde, *Who euer denied, but that we were sometimes members of the Church? And with what face can it be denied?*

Reply.

Who denyes it? So wee were once the *Children of wrath*, the members of Satan. What will you interre heere vpon? We were once *darknes*, but are now *light in the Lord*. therefore is *darknes light?* But what *Wee* doth M. Cholmley meane? Doth he not meane our Forefathers in the state & time of Popery? Yes surely. For els, blessed be God, now the generall generation of the present Church of England were neuer members of that Church, that *Synagogue of Rome*, and I trust neuer shall bee. But of our Forefathers, before the Councell of Trent, wee haue spoken elsewhere.

Pag. 41. what M Cholmley saith of my words [*Popery hath learned to get ouer the stile againe fast enough without our helpe*] is so trifling, that I passe it ouer. Also pag. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, I finde nothing but a bewraying of a nimble humour, apt to catch at shadowes, and to play at small play rather then fit out, if by any meanes hee may make his adversary contemptible. pag. 46. he saith, *Indeed it cannot bee denied to bee a great fault for any man to meddle in matters too high, and with persons too great for him.* This obiection is of great vse with M. Cholmley, as both before, and pag. 48, & 50. But first with persons I meddle not, whom I name not, but reverence as much, as M. Cholmley can doe: as for the Cause: Are the *Mysteries of Religion* too high for Ministers to meddle in. *Tractent fabrilia Fabri. Nanita de ventris, de tauris narrat arator, &c.* And may not any, must not Ministers bee exercised in the *Mysteries of Divinity*, the matter of their calling? I know not what priuiledge

M.

M. Cholmley, yea or yet (with due reverence be it spoken to their Lordships) the reverend Bishops haue aboue an ordinary and poore Minister of the Word, euen such as poore M. Burton, so vile in M. Cholmleyes eyes, to meddle, or (to speake more reverently) to handle, and treat of the *Eccles. 12.9.10.* high mysteries of Gods Word. whether they concerne the Mysteries of Christian godlinesse, or that of Antichristian impiety: vulesse M. Cholmley can prooue, that CHRIST gaue a greater power of the Keyes to Peter, then to the rest of the Apostles. Nor shall Master Cholmleyes supercilious wordes bee able to disaninate mee from labouring with the Preacher, according to my poore scatling to become wise, & to search out, & set in order, acceptable words, and an upright writing, euen words of trueth. So as my Ministry giues mee warrant sufficient to maintaine the trueth, and to refute the contrary, notwithstanding your objections, as if I wanted warrant, pag. 47. & 51. *And if any men, yea or Angell from Heauen* (sayth the Apostle, not I) *Preach otherwise, let him bee accursed.* The rest, pag. 48. 49. 50. 51. being of the same meale with the former, are not worth the boulting, as yeelding nothing but branne. Onely pag. 48, where hee sayth, *yet giue mee leaue to tell you, what I could say against you, if I were disposed:* Let mee say, that if euery hissing of M. Cholmeley were a sting, what would become of mee? Surely of your beeing disposed I doubt not, you haue giuen so good proofe thereof: but how true your proofes or reproofes haue beene, I leaue to the ingenuous and christianly disposed Reader. Nay your apt and prompt disposition (as it seemeth) is such, as it makes mee beleue you haue not much behinde to say, when onely you threaten to say it. And till your disposition serue to say more, I will suspend further answere, being alwayes as ready with all Christian ingenuity to acknowledge my errours, if there be just cause, as you disposed to tell mee of them. And as for mee (if you knew all) you shall find a

strong;

strong Cod in weake man.

M. Cholm. setting downe these words of mine : Yea  
my profession, not onely as a Christian, but much more  
as a Minister of the Gospell, bindes mee to it ;

M. Cholm. p. 51

Answeres:

Then let all Christendome goe together by the eares, and  
let Ministers be the ring-leaders and Boutefewes. .

Reply.

God forbid, M. Cholm. Are not you bound as a Minister of the Gospell, to defend the truth of Gods Word. Is not a part thereof to discouer vnto vs the Mystery of the great Whoore, and of Antichrist ? And doe not you know, that the Lambe, and those on his side, the called, and chosen, and faithfull, doe warre with the Beast, & her confederate crew ? Are they therefore Ring-leaders, Boutefewes? Cave dixeris.

M. Cholm.

Pag. 52, you conclude, that because some say it , that therefore it is a thing of all other, which I had most neede to purge my selfe of; namely; This contentious humour, which (you doe iay) is predominant in you, and so, presumptuous withall. If to contend for the truth, for the faith, M. Cholm. bee a contentious humour with you, I tell you, therein I will not yeeld to you an inch. You know by thistime, and will acknowledge it, that the truth is on my side, for which I haue so earnestly contended, as Iude exhorteth. Indeed (as I suppose) earnestly to contend for a bad cause, is a signe of a contentious humour. But before you minister your purgation, you should do wel to ask my Parishioners, whether this contentious humor be in me, or no; whether either for tithes or any other matters I haue gone to Law with any of them , or any other ; least otherwise , the poysون of your potion , not meeting with any such poysoned humour ( for venenum ve-

meno

*ueno expellitur) in stead of purging, may provoke the humour the more, & then at your perils be it: and take heed, least while you are so busie to purge out this contentious humour in me, it be found in your selfe predominant, and so the proverbe might be applied, Physician, heale thy self: rather hearken to Solomon, Contend not with a man without cause, much lesse, contend in a bad cause.*

Prov. 3.

*Pag. 54. M. Cholmeley excepts against the Mystery of iniquity, as not compatible with a false Church. For (saith hee) where is the mystery, if the Roman Church bee denied to be a true, or true visible Church of Christ? I answere: Is not the false, and vsurped name of the one and only Catholike Church sufficient to colour ouer the mystery of iniquity? Yea, this is the very mystery of iniquity (if M. Cholmeley vnderstand it not) for the whore of Babylon to goe vailed in the borrowed habit and title of the Catholike Apostolike Church.*

*And ibid. where I say, that a kinde of necessity hath imposed this taske vpon mee, to stand vp against the Church of Rome: M. Cholmeley, besides his ordinary gibing language in the next page hopeth hee shall make it appeare, that this necessity was neuer of Gods imposition. But I haue already made it appeare to the contrary, as before.*

*Pag. 60. (For I passe by his many interim idle times) M. Cholmeley quartels mee, for putting the Religion of Rome, for the Church of Rome: So also Pag. 61. where I put in this question, Whether any Papist by his religion can bee saved: hee saith I thus divide one question into two: For (saith hee) the question is, whether any man living and dying in a Papist, or member of the Church of Rome, may bee saved: and not, whether any Papist may be saved by his Religion. This therefore is a tricke of Lequierdumain, worthy such as pretend Gods glory in hypocrisy.*

H. Reply.

## Reply.

M. Cholmeleyes Ishmaelitish scoffing, biting, calumniating language, I leaue to the judgement of Him that made the tongue for better vses. But what is a Church, but according to its religion. For by religion I meane not devotion, but doctrine, in both which the Church of Rome is so blind. So that my meaning is plaine enough, vnlesse to a perverse interpreter, that for a Papist to be saved as a Papist, it is, to be saved by the meanes of his Religion: so that if M. Cholmeley will lay his peevishnesse aside, his more refined reason, and better judgement will not finde herein what more to object.

But pag. 60. hee brings the authority of S<sup>t</sup> Augustine about Baptisme in these words, *Ecclesia Orthodoxa, non Heresis, per Christi Baptismum generat, qui generantur filii Dei etiam inter Heteros.*

## Reply.

If this sentence thus alledged did any way make against vs, wee had just cause a little to quarrell M. Cholmeley, for not quoting the chapter whence he hath it. Thus Iesuites deale in their more generall allegations, to make vs either spend time, or loose our labour in seeking. I haue looked ouer the booke, and finde not this sentence: But wee will take it vpon trust: what would M. Cholmeley proue by it?

The Church of Rome to be a true Church, because it hath baptisme, and saving trueth, as hee glosseth vpon S<sup>t</sup> Augustine: For saving trueth wee haue already proued, they haue ouerthrowne it: For Baptisme in an Apostatical, Schismatycall, hereticall Church, how farre that may joyne it to the Catholike, or profit such an hereticall Church; let the same S<sup>t</sup> Aug. be vmpire, in the said booke; as cap. 1. *Apostates, saith he, may haue baptisme, so Schismatycall*

matickes and heretickes; but then Baptisme begins to profit them, when they come to be reconciled to the Church, which out of it, was unprofitably given. And chapter 12. Baptisme then profiteth for the remission of sinnes, where a man is reconciled to the unity of the Church, putting off the sacrifice of dissention, whereby his sinnes were holden. But this by the way; as it is offered, wee purpose, God willing, to handle this point of Baptisme, as it is in the Church of Rome, more fully in this entuing treatise.

Pag. 62. M. Cholmeley layes vpon him, light where it will, either my Author must marre a good cause in the handling. ( it is pittey M. Cholmeley had not had the handling of so good a cause, hee hath plaid the champion so brauely ) or I bely my Author: but he speakes at randome, and there I leaue him.

Ibid. he quarrels these words concerning a simple ignorant Papist: so then if a Papist be saued, he may thanke his ignorance.

Of this M. Cholmeley makes a wonderment: he brings S. Paul for instance; and therefore bids me, Apage.

Reply.

For Apage, he may giue it to his dogge. But why doth hee so wilfully divide my words from the true expresse sence: let him looke well whence hee hath them, namely, Vials, pag. 30. Answereth: and so ( to vse his phrase elsewhere ) let him lay his hand vpon his mouth.

Pag. 63. he sets downe my words: But Christ the foun-  
dation is there professed: well: but how will Popish ignorance  
teach a man to bee saued by Christ? Faith comes by hearing,  
and without faith no salvation by Christ: But all Papists are  
taught to hate and abhorre the preaching of the word; how  
then is it possible they should be saued? be they never so hum-  
ble and peaceable men.

To this M. Cholmeley answereth, The farther, the worse,  
&c, and sic for shame, that a man so well studieth in the myste-

M. Cholmeley

ry of iniquity, should be either so ignorant therein, or so ill affected to affirme so grosse an untrueth as that the Papists have not the saving or justifying faith, and the meanes of obtaining it, to wit, the preaching of the word of God. Reade the Councell of Trent, Sess. 5. cap. 2. & 24. cap. 4.

Reply.

For your, *The farther the worse*, M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley, wee shall see by and by to whom it properly belongeth: for the rest, beware least it bee not also retorted vpon you thus: *Fie on shame, that a man professing to be such an adversarie to Babylon, shoud yet bee so ignorant of the maine cause, why bee shoud hate and detest her.* I haue read ouer your places *Decretum de Reformatione*, alledged, to wit, *Sess. 5. cap. 2. & Sess. 24 cap. 4.* where I finde a Decree of Reformation to preach (what?) *Sanctum Iesu Christi Evangelium*, the holy Gospell of Iesus Christ. cap. 1. Sess. 5.

This is somewhat. But doth M Cholmeley take all this for good Gospell? I must intreat him to looke backe in the fourth Session, *Decretum de Canonis Scripturis, ut ablati erroribus, puritas ipsa Evangelii in Ecclesia conservetur, &c.* That errours being remoued, the purity it selfe of the Gospell may bee conserued in the Church. Of singular care and zeale to preserue the purity it selfe of the Gospell of Iesus Christ! Well. But what might this Gospell, and the very puritie thereof meane? What? The counsell there tells you: *Perspiciensq; &c.* And beholding this trueth and discipline to bee contained in Bookes written, and in Traditions vnwritten, &c. These jointly, written and vnwritten, as pertainning both to faith and maners, the Sacrosanct Oecumeniall and Generall Councell of Trent, doth with equall affection of pietie and reuersence, veretur & veneratur, religiounly embrase. Loe here, that which M. Cholmeley piouslly tooke even now for the holy Gospell of Iesus Christ, is here the Gospell of the holy Synod of Trent, such a Gospell, as never was decreed in a generall Council before:

before. This Gospell then must henceforth bee preached vniversally in the Church of Rome, as the rule of faith and maners, and that (forsooth) by a Decree of *Reformatio*. But besides all this, it is added there, *Si vero, quod absit Prudicator errores, aut scandala disseminauerit in populum, &c.* But if, which farre be it, the Preacher shall sow errors or scandals among the people, although he preach in his owne Monastery, or of any other order, let the Bishop forbid him to preach; *Quod si hereses predicaverit, contra eum, &c.* If hee shall preach heresies, let the Bishop proceede against him, according to course of law, or the custome of the place, yea although the Preacher himselfe pretend his exemption by generall or speciall privilege. According also hereunto is that other place, alledged *Seff. 24. cap. 4.* Now to summe vp all: I would gladly know of M. *Cholm.* what bee those errors and heresies, which must not bee preached in the Church of Rome. Hee must confess, will he, nill he, all those, which the holy Synod of Trent hath decreed and accursed for heresies. For this, I must put him to the trouble of reading ouer the whole Canons of Trent. But to saue the unpartiall and ingenuous Reader the labour, I will mention a few instead of all the rest. For the purpose, the grand heresies defined and branded by the Councell of Trent, are these: *To bee iustified by Christ's imputatiue righteousness: to bee iustified by faith onely: to haue such a faith, as is a sure affiance and confidence in Gods mercy: to abborre all kinde of merits, either of condignity or congruity: to refuse to invocate Angels and Saints, as Mediators: to refuse to worship Images, and Reliques: not to beleue Christ's body, flesh, blood & bone to be really or carnally present in the Eucharist: not to worship that contained under the Accidents of the bread with divine worship: not to account the Masse a propitiatorie Sacrifice, for quicke & dead, so to beleue a mans self to be purged from all his sinnes by the blood of Christ, as to condemne Purgatory: not to beleue all such doctrines of the Councell of Trent, to*

bee of equall authority with the Scriptures, which notwithstanding haue no warранs in the Scripture, yea and to beleue and receive them, non obstantibus, notwithstanding any A-

\* Bulla Pii 4. super declarati- postolicke \* constitution to the contrary: and the like. Now onem temporis there is an Apostolicke constitution to the contrary: Si &c.

Gal. 1. 8.9.

quis: If any man preach any other Gospeлl unto you, then that yee haue received, let him bee accursed. Yet behold the Councell of Trent hath irrefragably decreed a new Gospeлl, consisting of the word written and vnuwritten; but so, as all the saving doctrines ( I lay ) all the saving doctrines, without the preaching and receiving whereof, wee cannot ordinarily be saved, such as are expressly contained in the holy Scriptures, are made voyd, and accursed by Romes Traditions.

Obiect. But may not some predicanter Frier, or so; by preaching, bee a meanes to saue a soule in that Church of Rome?

Ans. Not possibly, if he keepe him strictly, as hee is bound, to the Canon rule of the Councell of Trent. But say hee shall transgresse these rules, and so preach the Word of Salvation to the people, as that soules come thereby to bee saved. For example, say, hee shall preach vnto them, that they must beleue to bee saved by nothing, but the merits and righteousness of Christ imputed vnto them; that they must not looke to bee saved by their inherent righteousness, but by the only mercy of God towards them in Christ; that every one must haue a particular faith and affiance of his own, for the pardon of his sinnes; that they must worship God onely, and pray vnto him, and that in Christ's name onely; that there is no sacrifice for sinne, but that of Christ, once offered vpon the crosse; that Christ's blood doth so purge away sinne, as there remaines no staine, nor punishment after this life: and the like. Indeede if any Frier of them all dare preach thus, I deny not, but he may be an instrument of saving many soules: But in the meane time, doth hee not fall vnder the heavy curse of

Trents

Trents Canons? Is not Inquisition presently made vpon him, as vpon an hereticke? Is hee not accursed with bell, booke, and candle? Is he not rewarded with fire and fagot? Or strangled in the dungeon of the Inquisition house? And for those people that haue drunke in those his saving do-ctrines to the comfort of their soules, are they not forced to recant, to doe penance, and what not? And if any one, or moe escape, and periere in the saving faith so receiued; doe they not retire and conceale themselues? Dare they avouch this faith of theirs? How then can any conclude here, that because some haply may be saved in the Church of Rome, therefore the Church of Rome is a true visible Church of Christ? When on the contrary, the whole Church of Rome in the generall, and according to the Canons of Trent, disclaimeth all those doctrines, which are saving, and alloweth those onely, which can never saue; as wee haue sufficiently proved. But if any accidentally, or rather by some speciall providence, secret power, and vnlimited mercy of God, shall come so to beleue, as thereby to be saved, is not he, and that his faith disavowed, and accursed of the Councell of Trent, as being not the faith of the Church of Rome, but accounted and accursed of her as hereticall?

Thus haue we seene (as M. Cholmeley hath desired) whether that be true, which I said.

But he addes: *It seemes he hath not beene beholden to any M. Cholmeley of those many cartloades of Homilies, Sermons, Postils, Meditations, the *Mas* and *Estivals*, which are so diligently preached in the Church of Rome, and farre better, more soundly, and diligently, since that Councell, then before; to which many of the ordinary preachers are much beholden.*

### Reply.

Alas, M. Cholmeley, you know me to be but a shallow fellow, but indeed my Living is so small, that I am not able to deale with cartloades, at least of Popish bookees, which cōming

ming frō farre verifie the proverbe, *Farre sought, & deare bought*; what therefore I want in money to purchase, I am faine to supply in making choyce of a few of the best bookeſ. But what talke you of these Popiſh *Homilies*, &c. I will vndertake, that one Homily of the Church of Eng-land, hath more ſound doctrine in it, then all your Homi-lies, Sermons, Poſtils, Meditations, Hiemals, and Eſtivals, put together. Nay, tell me, or ſhow me in all your copious reading of ſuch books, any one ſound ſaving doctrine: tell me not of your morall Discoures. I will fetch as good out of *Plato, Cicero, Seneca, Horace*, and ſuch like heathen Au-thors, as out of theſe their Schollars: And I am ſure, that a Christian ſhall reape, if not more profit, yet prevent more perils by reading heathen Au-thors, then theſe Popiſh ones you commend. Is not poyſon eaſily drunke in ſuch golden cups? Or are ſuch cups altogether tree from ſome poyſons? But you ſay, *they are farre better, more ſoundly and di-ſtinctly preached ſince that Councell, then before;* to which many of our ordinary preachers are much beholden. Surely, M<sup>r</sup> Chalmeley, if your ſelſe were an ordinary Preacher, as your Portiſh of Clare giues you leaue to bee extraordinary, but once a moneth, I ſhould thinke you were one of thoſe that are, if not too much beholden to Popiſh Au-thors, whose language your pen doth ſo fluently drop. But I could wiſh, that our Preachers were leſſe acquainted with Popiſh Au-thors, at leaſt, ſuch as are not thorowly ſeaſoned with the antidote of ſound doctrine and ſaving trueth; then, I am perſwaded, we ſhould haue fewer *Neu-tralizers*, & ſuch as ſpeake the language partly of *Aſhdod*, and partly of *Canaan*. And to tell you my affection that way, truely I cannot but take it in high indignation, when I heare any Preacher alledging any Popiſh Au-thor, as it were decking his ſermon with the borrowed colours & feathers of vncleane birdes: nor would I euer haue (if I might chufe) any Protestant Preacher, that is not a louer of the Church of Rome, to quote any Popiſh Au-thor, *honoris grattia*,

*gratia*, ( for wee haue farre more excellent of our owne) but only to beat them with their owne weapon, and to condemne them out of their owne mouth. But where you say, they are better since the Councell of Trent then before, wee haue shewed you before a sufficient difference for that, I hope, that wee neede not make any repetition.

‘But you adde: And I would they were not better taught ‘there in some places, then ours are (*dolens dico*) in many ‘Churches of England, Wales and Ireland.

*Reply.*

Surely you speake little for the credit of our Church. And I hope as vntruly. Nay let me tell you, if our meanest serued congregations haue no more, but a poore Curate to read Seruice, it is better meants of saluation, then any they haue in the best congregations in the Church of Rome. This I speake not, to excuse the neglect of preaching: God forbid. And wo to them by whom the neglect commeth.

Indeed (say you) they are taught to hate our Preachers, as M. Cholm. heretickes, and our preaching as heresy; and if hee say thereof, that they haue none at all, or hate all, he deceives himselfe and others with his old fallacy, à Disto secundum quid &c.

*Reply.*

Are they taught to hate the trueth in vs, and do they loue it at all, trow you, any where? yea dare any of them preach that sauing truth, which we preach? Speake, M. Cholmeley, giue vs one example: or perswade vs by some probable reason, how it may possibly be so, otherwise then I haue supposed. Till you show it, giue vs leaue to returne you your owne coyne, *you deceiue your selfe*, but I hope none else with you.

You conclude: *And if he say their preaching cannot breed true sauing faith, I pity him*: M. Cholmeley, I haue said so much hereof already, as may suffice any reasonable man.

M. Cholm.

Burton. pag. 67.

Reu. 18. Come out of her my people least &amp;c.

Cholmley.

' Babylon doth not alwayes signify the dominion and  
' Religion of the Beast: sometimes it is taken ~~mean~~, for  
' the very city, that is, the seat of his Dominion the City  
' of Rome, and so it is to bee vnderstood. Reuel. 18. So that  
' all that can be concluded, is this: That God calleth his out  
' the City of Rome, when it is vpon the point of De-  
' struction, that they may not bodily perish with the wic-  
' ked.

Reply.

M. Cholmley must giue mee leaue to oppose against his authority, the judgment of those, whose learning and gra-  
uity do every way outstrip his. First, M. John Fox, who vnderstands the fall of Babylon in a spirituall sense to bee principally meant of the Popish Religion. And *Quis tam talpa &c.* who is such a mole (sayth hee) as not to see this already fulfilled? Another, *Flaccus Ilyricus* vpon Reuel. 18. *Quod vero hic dicitur &c.* And that which is here said of the fall of that Babylon, seemeth rather to bee vnder-  
stood, of the spirituall fall of it, or of the greatnessse of er-  
rors, whereby it hath falne from the trueth of doctrine into horrible abominations, and from the fauour of God into his wrath, then of any other temporary, or eternall punishmēt. The Ministers & Preachers of the Gospel there-  
fore discouering Antichrist, & the errors of the Church, or rather of the whore of Babylō, shall witnesse that of Christ's Spouse she is become the strūpet of Satan, of the seat of sin-  
cere Doctors, the chaire of pestilēce; & of the Schoole of Si-  
mon Peter (who scarce euer was there) the Schoole of Si-  
mon Magus; of the Schoole of the Holy Ghost, the Schoole and Lay stall of all impure spirits and beasts: So hee. To these I might adde the interpretation of *Alphonsus Con-  
radus*, of M. *Perkins* in his reformed Catholike, of King *James* in his noble Paraphrase, and others of good note,  
that

that expound the comming forth of Gods people out of Babylon to bee both *Spirituall & Corporall*, according to Babylons fall in both kinds. And the text all along will beare the allegoricall and spirituall sense of Babylons fall very fitly. And M. *Cholmeley* s interpretation is too strait, for such a noble text : *for whereas the text saith, Come out of her my people, that ye be not partaker of her sins, & that ye receiuē not of her plagues, he would restraine it only to the present time of her plagues; whereas the danger of partaking of her sins, both spirituall & morall is no lesse, if not more to be avoided, then of her plagues.* It was dangerous for *Lot* to linger out the time till the very point, when Sodome was to be destroyed. Let not M. *Cholmeley* then goe about to animate Gods people, to abide in Rome, till the very time of the ruine of it, out of a hope that God will be mercifull to them in the very nicke, or because it is impossible for Gods Elect to perish. It is safest to bee furthest from danger; and wee know not how soone or sudainely it may surprize vs, at least if we say peace when God warants vs to beware. And K. *James* Papaphræteth, that Gods people should hasten out of Babylon, to the end they may not onely escape the plagues of her sinnes, but also may be instruments to plague her.

*The second question; whether a simple Papist beleeving and repenting, may be saued.*

M. *Cholm-  
ley*. pag. 68.

*Reply.*

M. *Cholmeley* quarrels mee, for saying the state of the question is here altered. And is not my Tenent, that a Papist as a Papist, cannot be saued? But to beleeue and repent, so as a man is saued, is not the property of a Papist, nor to be found in all the doctrine of the Church of Rome. But one thing which is necessarily included in my speech, vi- als, pag. 32. should haue beeene better considered and vnderstood of M. *Cholmeley*, which I therefore here supply. 'to wit, that a Papist comming to beleeue and repent to

saluation, this beliefe and repentance is not wrought in him by the ordinary doctrine of the Church of Rome, but either extraordinarily by Gods spirit, or otherwise, by meanes of hearing the word preached in the true Church, to wit, out of the Church of *Rome*. If M<sup>r</sup>. Cholmeley had obserued this well, he might haue spared many wast words and cavils, wherewith hee hath filled vp ffe or six pages, and all to no purpose, which I therefore passe ouer as ha-  
uing cleared the point sufficiently before.

M. Cholm-  
ley. pag. 72.

Only of his acute distinction of a Papist *in sensu compo-*  
*sito, & diverso*, a touch by the way. In the compound sense it  
signifieth an vntreformed Catholicke, that is, one that  
holds the same necessary heads of religion with the Pro-  
testant Churches; yet so, as hee retaines all errours in  
doctrine, whereby the said Religion is corrupted in the  
Church of Rome, ignorantly supposing them to bee the  
truthe of God. In the diuided sense, it signifies, one that  
holds the errors of the Church of Rome without respect  
to the Orthodox truthe maintained therein. Now to ap-  
ply this to our purpose: when wee say a Papist may bee  
saued, we understand it in the former, & more large sense.  
And whē he saith, a papist cannot be saued, he vnderstands  
it in the latter, and more striēt sense, and so wee are all  
agreed. This is the former point of his sophistry.

Qui statuit ali-  
quid parte in  
audita altera,  
notti qdseq.

*Reply.*

Stay; there goe more words to the bargaine. Wee are  
all agreed say you, you should firti aske my consent. But  
you must giue mee leaue not so suddainely to admit my  
Aduersary for arbitratour. I deny your distinction; I say,  
that every Papist doth either so hold the errours alone of  
the Church of Rome, as hee hath nothing to doe with the  
Orthodox truthe, or so as by holding the errours, hee quite  
ouerturnes all sauing truthe. For, tell mee M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley,  
lay but downe all the fundamentall errours of the Church

of Rome, which euery Papist (take him in what sense you will, *Composito* or *disviso*) must hold vntesse hee will cease to bee a Papist: and canne hee possibly withall hold the contrary truthes? Do you not know that all saving truthes contained in Scripture must vaile bonnet, and suspend, while Romes Traditions bee serued and obserued? Admit of her Traditions, Decrees, Canons, and what becomes of your Orthodox truthe? Orthodox Saving truth shee hath none, as wee haue before proued. And so your example of the malefactor is impertinent.

Thus, whose the *Sophistry* is, iudge you.

His distinction of a twofold renouncing, pag. 73, one actuall, and expresse, another virtuall, and infolded, being as impertinent to the purpose as the former, I could wish M. Cholmley would bestow it somewhere else, that it may not fall to the ground. And I wish M. Cholmley had no need of it himselfe, and that in no small measure. His friuolous and malitious cauils, to pag. 83, wee passe by, as more befitting the language of a Iesuite, then such as M. Cholmley should bee.

Pag. 83. Hee sets downe the comparison of the Maronian wine, and how I say, that Rome or Trent, hath made a dead vappa of the word of God. *Here, (hee sayth) his zeale transports him almost to blasphemy &c.* what blasphemy I pray you do you charge mee withall, M. Cholmley? But it is well you qualifie it with, *Almost*. For otherwise you might with the Lewes haue laid flatte blasphemy to Christ himselfe. For what say you to that speech of Christ (*Math. 15.6*) *Thus haue ye made the Commandement of God of none effect by your Traditions.* I pray you M. Cholmley, if you canne find a good interpretation for your Masters speech, deny it not to your brother, least malice transport you beyond the bounds of charity.

M. Cholm.

Pag. 86. So answerably, Rome must still bee a true visible Church, because the covenant betweene God and her still holdeth.

Reply.

M. Cholmeley hath talked much of the Covenant betweene God and the Church of Rome, as still in force. But hitherto he hath not brought one word to proue it.

Pag. 87. Hee quarrels mee, that I proue not in plaine termes, but onely Allegorically, the Covenant betweene God and the Church of *Rome*, to bee vtterly abrogated. What plaine termes doth M. Cholmeley require? That I should proue, that Christ in person should come into the Popes consistory, and there in open Court disclaime the Church of *Rome*, saying, O Church of *Rome*, formerly my Spouse, but now, since thou hast giuen vp thy selfe to play the whore with another, since thou hast broken and denied thy faith with mee, I do from henceforth vtterly renounce thee for my wife: And the Church of *Rome* on the other side, should profess in open Court in expresse forme of words, saying, O Christ, once my husband, but now, seing thou art gone into a farre Countrey, I haue in thy absence made choice of another husband, to whom I adhERE as my head, and therefore I will not from henceforth acknowledge any thy husbaudly power ouer mee, further, then my earthly Husband and Head, the Pope shall allow? Or what would M. Cholmeley haue.

But you proceede, pag. 88. 89. 90. there you prosecute the point of diuorce, betweene Christ and the Church of *Rome*. But first you say: If I were disposed to pick quarrels, I might haue excepted against many of your absurd phrases since I beganne to deale with you, and against one here, of a wifes Emancipating herselfe to another husband: But I aime at the maine point.

Reply.

It is well, that the maine point so carries you besides your

M. Cholm.

your naturall disposition to picke quarrels. But as wee haue had prooef of your criticisme in matter: so wee could bee content, to heare it in words, that wee might learne better to expresse our selues. But you change the phrase, and so offer violence a little to the word. *Emancipate*, which is, to captiuate ones selfe to another, as well as to free, will I hope well agree with the Church of *Rome*, who ( I say it againe, till you haue better corrected it ) hauing with drawne her subiection from the law of Christ's yoake, hath emancipated or subiected herselfe to the power of the Pope. And thus wee may take an estimate of the rest of thoe absurd phrases, which if you were disposed, you could picke quarrels with. But you aime at the maine point; wee joyne islie in that.

What is it then?

I make no doubt, but the Church of Rome hath long a-  
gone (euen many hundred yeares before the Councell of M. Cholm.  
Trent) broken the covenant of her God; and still abideth  
in that transgression, and so deserueth well enough to bee  
divorced from Christ forever: But that it was euer her  
desire to separate her selfe from Christ; it will neuer bee  
proued: nay it hath euer beeene her cunning to make him a  
couer and cloake of all her whoredomes and abominati-  
ons (as a subtile adulteresse dealeth with her long suffe-  
ring and patient husband) that so shee may seeme to bee  
a *Marran*, though shee be indeed a notable strumpet: and  
this is the highest point of the mystery of iniquity.

### Reply.

Heere is enough from M. Cholmleyes owne mouth, to confirm what wee haue laid, although it is not his meaning to resigne up his opinion. It was never her desire (sayth he) to separate her selfe from Christ. How knowes M. Cholm. that? Is hee so intimoously acquainted with Romes minde herein? But wee iudge men by their Deed and Act, not by their desire, as vnowne to vs. Yea wee may iudge  
of

of the desire by the outward Act, specially being an Act of habit, deliberated & concluded vpon, & stiffly maintained. Can all this be without a desire? who forced her to such an Act? yea M. Cholmley confesseth in same; that the Church of Rome, that strumpet, hath no other desire to be accounted Christ's Spouse, but in hypocrisy, and craft, to make him a couer and cloake for her whoredomes and abominations: therefore shee pretends onely the name of Christ's Spouse, whereas her desire is set wholly vpon another. And this is the very mystery of iniquity. This is the truest word M. Cholmley spake yet.

*M. Cholm.* But (sayth hee) onely the Clergy hath made oath of obedience to the Bishop of Rome, and the profession of the Roman faith.

*Reply.*

Why, M. Cholmley, is not the publicke Act of the Representitue Church, the Act of the whole? And do you not by the representitue, understand the Clergy, as pag. 16. which you distinguish from the popular part? Besides, doth not the whole popular state of the Church of Rome, assent to the publicke act of the Councell of Trent, and to the priuate oath of every Ecclesiasticall person, for absolute obedience to the Pope, as their head and husband? Do not all Papists profess and auow this? Can you bring one Papist that denies it? I would wish you better consider of it at your further leisure.

But I am heartily sorry you should paralell our oathes of Supremacy, Allegiance, and Canonicall obedience and our Subscription, to the oathes and subscriptions of the Clergy of the Church of Rome, whereby they subiect themselves to the Pope as supreme Head of the Church, and to all the Decrees and Canons of that harlot Church. Do not you know that thereby they vnite themselves as members to Antichrist their head? Do we by our Oathes, or subscriptions ascribe the whole power of Christ, or submit the Scepter of his word, to the authority of man, to dispense as him

him pleaseth. I suppose if M. Chol. did but imagine so, he would make some scruple at least of swearing and subscribing. And surely if it be the selfesame reason for which the fanatical Brownists and Anabaptists, as M. Cholmley saith, renounce society with vs : I would faine know of him, wherein they haue offended in so doing. Yea in so saying, M. Cholmley, you giue vs all cause to looke about vs , lest we fall into the same condemnation with the Church, or at least Cleargy of Rome in this case. But in the meane time (in my opinion) you haue giuen too much advantage to such separatists, you haue named, and left a most scandalous aspersion vpon the state of our Cleargy and Church,

Pag. 91. *That the Church of Rome was married to a second M. Cholm. husband in the Councell of Trent, & Christ excluded, or that these words, Come out of her my people, are a bill of Divorce, or that Christ by them separateth his spouse from her, wee utterly deny.*

*Reply.*

Here you haue 3 branches. You haue done with the first, you say. But doe not you know, that the Councell of Trent hath so married the Church of Rome to the Pope , as Christ is necessarily and by consequence excluded? Tel me, whether is the Popes voyce, or Christ's voyce of more authority with that Church. For the second, you appeale to Brightman, whom you are pleased to stile, my best Master, that [come out of Babylon] is meant of a local, not a spiritual separation. But good M. Cholmley doe not tye me Iurare in verba Magistris. I haue answered this before.

To the third, we say, that seeing the wife is the whoore, and M. Cholm. the whoore is Babylon , Christ intendeth not heere to separate his wife or spouse from Babylon; because in so doing, shee should separate his wife from his wife, and Babylon from Babylon, which implies a contradiction.

*Reply.*

Good God! Christ expressly commandeth his people to come out of Babylon, &c. Yet doth he not intend here to separate his wife or spouse from Babylon? Take heed M. Cholmley, you be not past almost blasphemey; much more past all blushing. For my part, I confess, I cannot but blush to heare such babell, that I may not say, babelling language, frō a brother Minister: That then Christs people in Babylon are Babylon, and Babylon is Christs spouse, & Babylon and Christs spouse may not be separated, for they are both one, & *to goe about to separate them, implies a contradiction.* Judge good Reader, what stuffe here is. Babylon is the whore, how then is she Christs spouse, sith Christs spouse is a virgin? Can she be both a whore, and a virgin?

M. Cholm.

But it may bee these wordes are but an Introduction to his Authors words alledged, ibid. to wit; *As it is a visible Church, we haue not detrected to bold communion with it; as Babylon, we can haue nothing to doe with it.*

### Reply.

I perceiue he that holds of the Church of Rome, holdes a wolfe by the eares, which it is as difficult to let goe, as dangerous to hold. But M **Cholmley**, I will not any more deale with these words, as your Authors, but as yours, sith you haue assument the whole quarrell vpon your selfe. I say then that a true visible Church of Christ, and Babylon, are ~~asociate~~, they are no way compatible. A true visible Church cannot be Babylon, and Babylon cannot bee a true visible Church. Christ may haue his secret Church in Babylon, but this Church is not visible, as not daring openly to profess the faith of Christ; nor is this Church Babylon, nor of Babylon, but in Babylon. Now I proue that Babylon cannot be the visible Church of Christ, thus:

**Babylon is Babylon, as it is Babylon:**

But Babylon as it is Babylon is not the visible Church of Christ. Therefore Babylon is not the visible Church of Christ. Till

Till M. Cholmley answere this Argument, let mee put him in minde of the sentence, which he hath ( of purpose, as it appeareth) omitted in my answer: where, after these words,  
 ' By what distinction? (I pray you) can an honest and chaste  
 ' matron salue her credit, by keeping company, or hauing  
 ' communion with a notorious strumpet? *he hath left off the*  
 ' inference following, will she say, As shee is a woman, a crea-  
 ' ture of the same flesh and blood, as being the Image of  
 ' God, I detrect not to hold communion with her? *Or I might*  
 ' *have said thus*, Such a woman is wife to an honest man,  
 ' but she playes the notorious strumpet with another: wel,  
 ' as shee is such a mans wife, I detrect not to hold commu-  
 ' nion with her: but as she is a filthie strumpet, I may haue  
 ' nothing to doe with her. M Cholmley might as well argue  
 thus: *As the Church of Rome is the whore of Babylon, we haue*  
*nothing to doe with her; but as she is a virgin, Christ's spouse, we*  
*detrect not to hold communion with her.* This Distinction  
 will proue good, when euer M Cholmley can proue,  
 that one & the same woman may be at the same time, both  
 a whore, and a chaste virgin, in a different respect. Againe, in  
 such a flat contradiction, he should doe well to resolue vs,  
 which of these to preferre, & which to exclude, whether  
 wee should detrect altogether to holde communion with  
 her, as a whoore; or we should hold communion with her,  
 as she is a spouse. As also, how wee may with keeping both  
 our credit, and good conscience, both communicate with  
 her as a spouse, & not communicate with her as a whore.  
 But enough (I feare) of these contradictions, & solecismes,  
 or bad coherences.

‘ Pag. 95. That the Reformed Churches never made a ful M. Cholm.  
 ‘ and totall separation from the Church of Rome, but only  
 ‘ partiall, from her corruptions; Jewell saith, *Non tam ab ea,*  
*quam ab eius erroribus discessimus.*

Reply.

Jewell saith not, *Non ab eis*, but *Non tam ab ea*, He speaks  
 comparatively, not<sup>g</sup> positivly: Not so much from her,

as from her corruptions and errors. Hee saith not, Wee haue not departed from her. But what saith the same *Jewels Apology* *Jewell* a little before. They seeke to choke vs, *saith he*, with cap.9. sect.3. the bare name of the Church. *And againe, ibidem*. These men now, after they haue le't nothing remaining in the Church of God, that hath any likenesse of his Church, yet

sect. 1.

[ sect. 2.

will they see me the Patrons, and the valiant maintainers of the Church. *And cap. 10.* These mens parts had bee ne, first to haue truely and clearely proued, that the Romish Church is the true and right instructed Church of God. *And ibid.* For our parts if we could haue judged Ignorance, Error, Superstition, Idolatry, Mens Inventions, & the same commonly disagreeing with the holy Scriptures, either to please God, or to bee sufficient for obtaining of euerlasting saluation; Or if we could ascertaine our selues, that the Word of God was written but for a time only, and after a time againe ought to bee abrogated, and put away: or els, that the sayings and commaundements of God ought to be subject to Mans wil, that what soeuer God sayth and comandeth, except the Bishop of Rome will, and commaund the same, it must bee taken as voyde and vnspeaken: if we could haue brought our selues to beleue these things; wee grant, there had bee ne no cause at all, why we should haue left these mens company. So our *Jewell*.

*M. Cholm.*

You adde to *Jewels Apologie*, M. *Perkins* reformed Catholicke, *Wherein hee shewes in euery head of doctrine, how farre wee may and must holde communion with that Church.* So you.

*Reply.*

But I would M. *Cholm.* would marke what the same *M. Perkins* in his Epistle Dedicatory to that treatise, sayth: It is a notable policy of the Deuill (sayth he) which hee hath put into the hearts of sundry men in this age, to think

these

'that our Religion, and the Religion of the present Church  
 'of Rome, are all one for substance: and that they may bee  
 'reunited, as (in their opinion) they were before. But  
 'let men in shew of moderation, pretend the peace and  
 'good estate of the Catholike Church, as long as they  
 'will: this vniion of the two Religions can neuer bee made,  
 'more then the vniion of light and darknesse. And this  
 'shall appere, if we doe but a little consider, how they of  
 'the Romane Church haue razed the Foundation. And a  
 'little after: It should be a great height of vnthankfalus  
 'in vs, not to stand out against the present Church of  
 'Rome, but to yeeld our selues to plots of reconciliation.  
 So he. And in his preface: The first reason in his Dis-  
 'course is, To confute all such Politickes, as hold and main-  
 'taine that our Religion, and that of the Roman Church,  
 'differ not in substance, and consequently, that they may be  
 'reconciled. Doth the Church of Rome raze the Founda-  
 'tion? Then what communion with her? yea in that Tre-  
 'tise vpon these words, *Go out of her my people*, hee makes  
 'this obseruation: That all those who wilbe saued, must  
 depart and separate themselues from the faith and religion  
 of this present Church of Rome. How then will this agree  
 with M. Cholmley. Wee must hold communion with that  
 Church? Yes, *Est quoddam prodire tenus*, so farre we may  
 and must hold communion with that Church. How farre,  
 and wherein M. Cholmley? In the points set downe in the  
 Reformed Catholike, so farre. But doe not you know,  
 that they say one thing in the generall, and quite ouer-  
 throw it in their particular conclusions? They holde the  
 Scriptures in generall, but ouerthrow them in particu-  
 lar, namely by their Traditions, and the Papall Oracles:.  
 thus I might instance in all other fundamentall doctrines,  
 which are mentioned by the councell of Trent; so that  
 when they haue summed vp all, they haue not one  
 true intire sauing doctrine left. Name one, if  
 you canne, Master Cholmley, I say, one intire

sauing doctrine , which they haue not directly overthrowne, either expressly, or by necessary consequence if you cannot, take your Calumniator away with you. For the sauing truth, which we hold, is not Romes sauing truth, they haue nothing to doe with it, they haue denied, abjured, accursed it, as we haue shewed. Wherein therefore can either you, or any Author of yours, shew our communion with the Church of Rome ( I meane for sauing truth) but it must be with her deceivable errors, & doctrines of Deuils? Or what communion can you haue with the Church of Rome, but in some of her Additionalls, wherewith shee undermineth the Fundamentall Truths? Till you can shew it to be otherwise, better then yet you haue done, bee not so prodigall of your reproachfull language, which you continue pag. 97, and all along.

*M. Cholm.* Pag. 99. M. Cholmley saith. *Some men are nettles, which if a man handle softly, they sting him: but if hardly and roughly, they are not felt.* Hereby hee insinuates with his reverend Author, to deale with me accordingly. But I tell you M. Cholmley, take heed, lest while you thinke to crush a nettle, you finde it a thorne, which the more it is crushed, the deeper it pierceth. And truth is, a Lillie among thornes , against which you will finde it hard kicking.

Pag. 100. hee addes: *The Reuerend Author must use them like bounds, which the more a man beateth, the better they loue him; or like the Wilde Irish, which are most serviceable, when they are most flaunishly used.* You mistake the matter a little. I am neither of the bound nor Spaniel kinde, dogges of game. And you know how incanonicall it were for such Reuerend Authours to meddle with such dogges. Nor haue I at any time M. Cholm. like those dogges, licked vp my Masters spittle, were he never so reverend, in hope of some fat mortell from his fuller dish. I am indeed a poore dogge of the flocke, or if you will , a Mastife, to watch my Masters house: If wolues or theeues approach,

approach, I may perhaps barke; but if they presse mee, and I bite them, blame mee not, I doe but my kinde, to defend my Masters trust. And that you compare me to the Wilde Irish, as most *seruiceable*, whē most *flauisblie vſed*: you may know M. *Cholm*. I was never flauet to any man, much leſſe as for any mans cause to be ſeruiceable vnto Antichrist againſt Christ; to the whore of Babylon, againſt the Mother Church of *England*. The wilde Irish indeed are a generation of Satyrs, fit to daunce after your Satyricall pipe, M. *Cholm*: they cannot but like your defence of their Romiſh mother, they could well enough brooke ſuch Preachers among them. But God bee thanked they are packt home againe, that vpon no termes, they can bee ſo ſeruiceable for Romes faction.

Pag, 101. M. *Cholm*. ſets downe my wordes: *Is outward profeffion a ſufficient marke of viſibilitie for a Church? This is none of thofe markes, which the Church of England takes notice of a Church by.*

*Cholmley.*

No? Are they not the preaching of the Word, Adminiſtration of Sacra‐ments, & Eccleſiaſticall Discipline? And what outward profeffion of Christianity can any viſible Church make without theſe? Outward profeffion therefore comprehendeth them all, and ſo is a ſufficient marke of the viſibility for a Church.

*Reply.*

M. *Cholm*. your rauing language in the former page, promiſed ſome roucing matter in this. For what can bee more ſenſleſſe, then to inferre, that where there is outward profeffion, there muſt bee the true markes of a viſible Church? The Church of Rome profeffeth to bee the true Church, yea the onely Catholick Church, & to haue all the marks; but therefore hath ſhe them? therefore is ſhee ſuch as ſhee profeffeth? yea the Church of *England* denies the Church

of

of Rome the true markes of a visible Church; but you will proue the contrary by their outward profession. But how you haue proued this, we haue shewed before.

Pag. 102. The Samaritans profession of the Jewish religion you disproue, as being neuer in the covenant, but Aliants from the common-wealth of Israel. I doe not bring that instance, to proue that they were in the covenant: but that they had outward profession of a Church. Had they not Iewish Priests sent among them, of whom they were circumcised without the signe of Gods covenant, and of whom they learned the manner of the Iewish religion. But

¶ Faciunt fa-  
uors & vesp[er]:  
faciunt Ecclesi-  
as & Marcion-  
t[er]: Tertul[us] ad-  
vers. Marcion.  
lib.4.  
by this you see, that the ¶ outward profession is not suffi-  
cient to make or demonstrate a true Church. And doe not  
you holde, that a particular Church may so fall from her  
covenant with God, by destroying the very foundation of  
faith and religion, as it she had neuer been in the covenant,  
and shee may retaine an outward profession still? Is shee  
therefore a true Church? What say you of the Arrian  
Churches, who yet retained some outward markes, they  
had the Scriptures, the Creed, the Sacraments, but not pure-  
ly according to Christ? Were they therefore true Chur-  
ches.

\* Aliud est quod ches. \* D. Whitakers faith, It is one thing to challenge, aho-  
vendicetur. Ali ther to challenge lawfully, and by right. So Papists ( faith  
ud quo iure. A- he ) doe challenge the lawfull use of the Lords Supper:  
liud est vendi-  
care: aliud iure  
& legitimate  
taker de Eccle-  
sia controv[er]sia.  
Qu:5. sic Pa-  
pist[us] vendicant  
legitimum v.  
sumCenz. &c, really affected, are not so? The Iewes would never doe it, neither  
will the Baptists doe it, neither will the reformed Churches  
doe it, neither will any well informed Christian doe it. But you  
will not much stand ypon it.

Pag. 103, 104. M. Cholmley quarrels my not much stan-  
dard with the Church of Rome for the bare name of a  
Church, &c. saying pag. 104.  
You are verie libell of that which is none of your owne:  
Can you be content to afford the precious name of a Christian  
and of a Church to them, which in mans judgement, not par-  
ticularly affected, are not so? The Iewes would never doe it, neither  
will the Baptists doe it, neither will the reformed Churches  
doe it, neither will any well informed Christian doe it. But you  
will not much stand ypon it.

Reply.

Reply.

First, you seeme to strike at my Name, wherein it will  
haply appeare, you are more prodigall of that which is  
your owne, I meane a malicious tongue, then I liberall, as  
of a thing not mine owne: for that which I stand not vpon  
much with the church of Rome, & the members thereof,  
about the bare Name of a Church, and of Christians. And  
will not you allow your brother the bare name of a Christian.  
The name of a Church indeed is none of his own.  
But you turne *Bare name* into a *Precious name*. This I stand  
vpon, not to belong to the Church of Rome at all. There  
is great oddes betweene a bare name, & a precious name.  
Or haue you any speciall quarrell to my precious name,  
that you thus bring it in by head and shoulders ? Indeede  
no mans name is in his owne power, but in others. And  
it must needes fare ill even with the best name, when it  
comes to bee tossed vpon the pikes of serpentine tongues.  
Our Name is no lesse tender, then our eye, but more incur-  
able, when hurt. A mote in the eye, the tongue of a friend  
gently lickes out: but the least mote on our name, is by  
the tongue of fame made a beame. If my name haue  
suffred here, whether through mine owne folly, or others  
malice: yet my comfort is, it is written, there, where nei-  
ther the inbred moth of sinfull nature, nor the backebiting  
theete commeth. And I assure you, M *Cholmeley*, I can  
with farre greater patience heare and beare all your re-  
prochings, then I can beare with my selfe, for the least of-  
fence to God, or men. How can you justly fasten any re-  
proach vpon me, as I stand both in Gods court, and of  
mine owne conscience, though I abhorre my selfe. And if  
ought but good haue befallen my name, I am more beholdē  
to your malice for telling me, then to any mans loue. Nor  
was I ignorant, when I first entred the lists of these con-  
troversies, but that I should thereby exasperate malevolent

## L tongues

tongues and spirits against me. But I passe not for all, so I may glorify God, though I be nothing. And I know it is not for nothing, that hee hath thus humbled mee to the very dust. Howsoever hee dealeth with mee, I haue still cause to blesse his name.

But to allow the bare name of a Church to that of Rome, do ye reprove it in mee, when yee sticke not to force vpo it, not only the *name*, but the very essence of a true visible Church of Christ? This the Church of England doth not, this the reformed Churches doe not, this the learned'ſt Divines of our Church haue not done: yet may wee not suffer them to glory in the bare name of a Church, the very name of a Church being the first Note of *Bellarmines* 15, to know the Church of Rome by? The true name of a Jew is *precious*, as *Rom. 2.29.* yet wee deny them not the bare name at this day. Thus wee call Papists Christians, but we do not meane true Christians. Thus we say, *The Church of Rome*, but we doe not meane it is a true Church of Christ. Yea your ſelue confeffeth, that in mans judgmēt not partially affected, the precious name of a Church belongeth not to the Church of Rome: why then are you ſo partially affected, as to defend it for a true Church, and yet ſo farre to forget your ſelue, as to quarrell with me, for not much ſtanding with it for the bare name?

His repetitions (pag. 105.106.) we having before fully answered wee passe by: Onely I cannot balke his wordes, pag. 106. Yet if they haue the ſhell, that is, the outward profesſion of their foundation directly, it is enough to make them be ſaid to hold the foundation directly. So M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley. It is enough to M Cholmeley, to proue the Church of Rome to hold the foundation directly, if they may be but ſaid to hold the foundation directly; though all their hold they may put in a nut-shell. I cannot better compare M Cholmeleyes maintayning the Church of Romes holding the foundation directly, then to the man in *Plutarch*, in holding his ſhippe, who when one hand was cut off by the enemy, held

held fast by the other, and when that was cut off too, got hold with his teeth. Thus M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley goes on tooth and naile to keepe his Tenet, his hold. For to proceede, pag. 107. hee stiffly denies, that the Church of Rome, or the Councell of Trent, doth directly deny this foundation, to wit, the righteousnesse of Christ, imputed to vs for our Iustification. But I proue it, alledging the councell of Trent. Sess. 6. Can. 10. *Si quis dixerit homines per ipsam Christi iustitiam formaliter iustos esse. Anathema sit.* It any shall say, that men are formally just by the very righteousnesse of Christ, let him be accursed.

Now let vs heare M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeleyes expresse answere.

'Is this an expresse, flat, and direct deniall of the foundation? then Melanchton, Calvin, Illyricus. and all sound and good Protestants, doe expressely, flatly, and directly deny the foundation: for all of them doe, and must hold this doctrine for accursed: and all the Ministers of the Church of England haue cause to bee ashamed of your ignorance and boldnesse.

M. Cholmeley

'( M<sup>r</sup> Burton ) who dare challenge the Church of Rome 'to deny the foundation directly, in that wherein shee 'holdeth and confirmeth the trueth of the Gospell. You 'must know therefore, that in these wordes is condemned 'the damnable doctrine of Andrew Osiander and his fol- 'lowers, who taught and held, that a man is formally justi- 'fied by the very righteousness by which Christ himselfe 'is essentially just and righteous, being partakers thereof 'by inhabitation. This allegation therefore, is a notable 'abuse, not onely of the councell, but of your selfe, & the 'Reader. See Bellarmine de Iustif. lib. 2. cap. 2. *His verbis:* 'thoough himselfe offend therein also afterwards.

Reply.

To the end it may appeare which of vs [ M<sup>r</sup> Burton, or you M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley ] all the Ministers of the Church of England, haue cause to be ashamed of for ignorance and boldnesse: it is requisite, that we doe more fully declare the minde,

purpose, and scope of the councell of Trent in the fore-  
told place, *Sess. 6. canon. 10.* As also, what was the opinion  
of *Andrew Osiander*. Which when we haue done, I referre  
all to the judgement of all the *Ministers of the Church of  
England*.

First, for *Osianders* opinion, wee finde it set  
downe by *Calvin, Institut. lib. 3. cap. 11. sect. 8.* *Hoc Osi-  
andri placitum est, quum Deus & Homo sit Christus, respectu  
divinae nature, non humanae factum nobis esse iustitiam*: It is  
the invention of *Osiander*, whereas Christ is both God  
and Man, that in respect of his Diuine Nature, and not his  
humane, hee is made vnto vs righteousnesse. And *Sect.  
9. Iustitiam Dei inflatis buccis attollit Osiander, & triun-  
pha canit, quasi emicerit esse spectrum illud suum essentialis  
iustitiae.* *Osiander* doth with blowne vp cheeke advance  
the righteousnesse of God, and soundes the triumph, as if  
hee had evinced it to bee that phantasie of his, of essenti-  
all righteousness. Or as *Buchanus* sets it downe: *Osian-  
ders* opinion was (saith hee) that men were made just, by  
the essentiall righteousness of God, that is, the righte-  
ousnesse, vwhich is the very Diuine Essence.

*Buchanus de  
justif. error  
Osiandri.*

In the next place, let vs see, vwhat is the  
maine scope of the councell of Trent, in determin-  
ing the formall cause of justification. This is set  
downe, not in ambiguous, but cleare tearmes in  
the *6. Session, cap. 7.* to vwhich the canon by me  
alledged, hath speciall reference, as vvee may see in  
the margent ouer against the tenth canon, vwhere is put,  
*supra cap. 7.* Now the summe of the councell in the *7.*  
chapter, about the formall cause of justification, is to ex-  
clude the righteousness of Christ imputed to vs as the  
formall cause of our iustification, and to admit no other  
formall cause, but inherent righteousness in vs. The  
wordes

wordes of the councell are: *Denuntiata una formalis causa est iustitia Dei: non qua ipse iustus est, sed qua nos iustos facit: qua videlicet ab eo donata, renoniamur spiritu mentis nostre, & non modo reputamur, sed vere iuste nominamur & sumus, iustitiam in nobis recipientes, unusquisque suam secundam mensuam, quam Spiritus Sanctus partitur singulis prout vult, & secundum proprium suumque dispositionem & cooperacionem.* *Quoniamque enim nemo possit esse iustus, nisi cum merita passionis Domini nostri Iesu Christi communicantur: id quatenus in hac ipsis iustificatione sit, dnm eiusdem sanctissime Passionis merito per Spiritum sanctum. charitas Dei effunditur in cordibus eorum, qui iustificantur, &c.*

But ( saith M. Cholmeley ) you must know, that in these wordes ( to wit Canon 10. ) is condemned the damnable doctrine of Osiander. What? of Osiander onely? or mainly? How proues hee that? See Bellarmine. Bellarmine indeede saith, that by *Iustitia Dei, qua ipse iustus est* ( as chapter 7. ) is rejected the opinion of Osiander. What then? was it therefore the maine scope of the councell, there to meete vwith the opinion of Osiander? No, Bellarmine vpon that 7. chap. Sess. 6. shewes, how the councell rejects other opinions and errors besides, as imputatiue righteousness for one; Iustification by faith onely; a twofold righteousness, imputatiue, and inherent, iudiciary justification by remission of sinnes. And indeede howsoever this imputatiue righteousness bee shuffled among those five opinions, and errors mentioned: yet this is the maine aymed at. Yea Bellarmine in the very next section, summes vp the vwhole state of the question of formall justification, set downe, cap. 7. Sess. 6. thus: *Porro status est, &c.* Moreover the state of the whole controversy may be reduced to this simple question;

question, whether the formall cause of absolute iustification, bee inherent righteousnesse in vs, or not. Againe, in the 10 Canon by mee alledged, the councell speakes not of the righteousnesse of God, simply, but of Christ onely: But Os. anders opinion was of the righteousnesse of God, not of Christ, God & Man. So that this Canon being referred in the margent to the 7 chapter, it expoundes the righteousnesse of God there, to bee meant of the righteousnesse of Christ.

Andr. Vega lib.  
7. de causis Iu-  
stit. c. 22. quod  
Christi iustitia  
neque sit, neq;  
possit esse cau-  
sa nostræ Iu-  
stificationis.

A. Vega also commenting vpon the same point of *formall iustification*, taking the councels wordes alledged for his text, makes this to bee the summe. *Non iustificari, &c.* We will plainlye teach, that sinners are not justified by the righteousnesse of Christ, as by the formall cause of their justification, and that the righteousnesse of Christ neither in it selfe, neither as communicated vnto vs, and after it's maner made ours, is the formall cause of our justification. And a little lower he saith, " That inherent righteousnesse were superfluous, if so bee wee were just formally by the righteousnesse of Christ, as they of Cölen thinke. Therefore sole righteousnesse inherent shall suffice to make men just, and it is altogether superfluous, and abhorring from all Phylosophie, for this to put any righteousnesse, to wit, the imputatiue righteousnesse of Christ. So Vega. Nay, so all Pontifician writers. See Chemnitius his *Examen de Iustificatione*. Is the case then of the councell of Trents ouerthrowing the maine foundation of justification in the onely formall cause thereof, Christs righteousnesse imputed, vpon due triall, so cleare? How comes then M. Cholmley to be thus egregiously deceived: surely I know not, vnlesse Chemnitius render the reason, *Ipsum verò artificium, &c.* But the artifice, whereby the Architects, or master-builders of these Decrees haue so involved & wrapped the thing it selfe vnder some shew, least it should by & by of the vnskilfull bee smelld out, is worthy of observation. But can we impute ignorance, or vnskilfulness to M. Cholmley? Perhaps it is but an ouerweaning

overweaning opinio of his wit, that he may say what hee will, supposing that such an ignorant & shallow fellow as M *Burton*, is not able to say Boh to a goose. Shall I say, it is not any propensity of affection to defend Popery, farther then to vnderprop the party, or part he hath undertaken to defend. Whatsoeuer it is, that I leauie *in media*, to the judgement of all the Ministers of the Church of England to decide as I said before.

But after all this stirre, say, I had alledged one place, then which I might haue alledged another more proper and peripicuous. M. *Cholmeley* knew, that the ground of my allegation, was to proue, that the councell of Trent overthrew the foundation, by denying justification by the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Doth M. *Cholmeley* defend the church of Rome herein? yes surely; for let vs come to another canon of Trent, wherein M. *Cholmeley*, with no lesse felicity, cleares them from ouerthrowing the foundation of justification.

*Pag. 108.* hee set downe my wordes: "And in the 11<sup>th</sup> canon, if any man shall say, that men are justified, either by the sole imputation of Christ's righteousness, or by sole remission of sins, (otherwise then by inherento righteousnesse in vs obtained thereby) or also that the grace of God, whereby wee are justified, is onely the fayour of God: let him be accursed. What more direct deniall of the foundation?"

To which M. *Cholmeley* answereth, *pag. 109.* "I might here challenge you for altering and changing the wordes of the councell, but I will not take all advantages: I answere therefore, that it seemes you know not the true meaning of the councell; or taking the word Iustification in the councells owne sense; this canon containes very sound and christian doctrine. What then doth it meane by Iustification? A compound of Protestant Iustification, and Sanctification; for so it defines Iustification: cap. 7. of this Session in the first wordes: *Iustificatio est non sola.*

*sola peccatorum remissio, sed & sanctificatio & renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiae & donorum: and so the sense and meaning of the canon is this: If any man shall say, that men are so justified by the sole imputation of Christ's righteousness, or by sole remission of sinnes, that they are also sanctified thereby, without inherent grace and charity: or also, that the grace, whereby we are so justified, is only the favour of God; let him bee accursed. And let him be indeede so for me. You will say, this is nothing but meere juggling. I grant it: but it is not direct deniall of the foundation: For here ( as Chemnitius acknowledgeth) is both remission of sinnes, and imputation of Christ's righteousness included; which, though it be sufficient to justification in the Protestant sense, yet in the Popish sense ( wherein sanctification is required) it is not sufficient.*

*Reply.*

Your moderation (M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley) in taking all advantages, I cannot but admire. But (I confess) I cannot so easily forbear your altering and changing of the Councells sense, as you say I haue done the wordes. Although you haue added something to my wordes, and to the councells text. But I passe it by. First I will make good mine owne (although I haue but expressed the councells sense more clearely, by the 7<sup>th</sup> chapter, (as I haue noted in the margent.) The Canon intire is thus. If any shall say, that men are sanctified, either by sole imputation of Christ's righteousness, or by sole remission of sinnes, excluding grace and charity, which is diffused in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and is inherent in them: or also, that the grace, whereby we are justified, is onely the favour of God: let him bee accursed. Now (M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley) you grant, that this is nothing, but meere juggling: Is it so? How then can you say (without juggling) that this Canon containes very sound and christian

christian doctrine taking the word justification in the counsells owne sense? you take it for a compound of Protestant justification, and sanctification. And is this I pray you very sound and christian doctrine? yes, as you state the sense of the canon, the true sense whereof you say is this, If any man shall say, that men are so justified by the 'the sole imputation of Christ's righteousness, or by sole 'remission of sinnes, that they are also sanctified thereby 'without inherent grace and charity: or also, that the grace 'whereby wee are so iustified, is onely the fauour of God, 'let him be accursed: and let him so bee indeed, for mee, say you; yea? will you say Amen to Trents Anathema? will you curse him that shall say, *The grace whereby wee are iustified is onely the fauour of God?* Will not you say so? otherwise you lye vnder the Anathema of the Apostles canon. Gal. 1.8. *If any man, yea or an Angell from heauen preach any other Gospell unto you then that wee haue preached unto you, let him be accursed.* Read Gal. 2.20. *Who loued mee, and gaue himselfe for mee. Is not the onely loue and fauour of God in Christ the grase whereby wee cometo bee iustified?* And Rom. 5.16. *The free gift is of many offences unto iustification.* And Rom. 3.24. *Being iustified freely by his grace &c.*

But it may be you meant your curse respectiuely to the former part of your canon. But according to your glosse, how do ye thinke the Pope & his conclaue the great propugners and viudicators of Trents canons, will take this interpretation of yours? Do you goe about to make the canon speake nothing, but very sound and christian doctrine: and do you thinke to escape their Anathema? Doe not you confess it meere juggling? And do you thinke in good earnest all this while, that so many choice wits assēbled in that church, spending no leſſe then 7 monethes in this one sixt Session, beating their busie and actiue braines, how they might with most artifice weave such a webbe, such a mystery of iniquity, as therewith to intangle the Flyes: that their vpshott was to decree indeed,

sound and Christian Doctrines? M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley, do not deceiue vs, by making vs beleeue yee are so simple. But on the other side, you say, that justification taken in the Coun- cels owne sente, is nothing else but *a compound of Protestant Justification and sanctification*. How doth this agree with your Canon, as you haue set it downe? There you di- stinguish plainly betweene justification and sanctifica- tion: how then do ye make a compound of them? And you may know, that in this case, the very composition and mix- ture quite marres and alters the property of such simple. For if justification and sanctification bee compounded, to make vp one justification, as a purgation for sinne, your justification proues altogether vncorrectuall. Nor can I see how these two can possibly bee compounded, I meane the Protestans justification and sanctification, to make vp the Popish justification, each of the Simples retaining their properties. For the protestant justification is the Imputa- tion of Christs righteousness, no infused, or inherent. Againe Protestant Sanctification is no part of our justifi- cation in Gods sight. So that compounding justification with sanctification, it is by the Councell of Trents Alchi- mistry all turned into sanctification at the best, though indeed it be neither justification, nor sanctification, but haue the name of justification. For the Councell of Trent, and all Potifician writers vpon it, allow but one kind of justifi- cation and that is inherent, they wholly exclude justifi- cation by imputation, taken in the Protestants sente.

Wherewpon *Andreas Vega*, Trents interpreter, disapro- ueth the double justification of the Prouince of Colon, one, by the imputation of Christs righteousness by faith: the other: Renovation of the inner man. Wherfore *Vega* saith, *Quare cum ipsi non negent, &c.* Wherfore, sith them- selves do not deny inherēt righteousness, they ought even by this argument to haue beene moued, not to beleeue, that any man is justified by the righteousness of Christ, as *Justif. cap. 22.* by the formal cause. So hee. Thus wee see what a confusi-

*Andreas Vega*

*lib. 7. de causa*

*Justif. cap. 22.*

*by the formal cause.*

*So hee.*

*Thus wee see what a confusi-*

on

on M<sup>c</sup> Cholmeley hath brought his *Compound of Protestant justification and sanctification* vnto: whereof while he would make one medicine to rectifie the Canon of Trent, and to make it, vtter against the will, *very sound and Christian doctrine*: hee is like to runne such a hazzard, as *Pauls* vessell, which runne aground, and was wracked betweene two seas. Againe, I cannot but admire, that any so well growne Minister in the Church of England should bewray such ignorance in so maine a doctrine, as justification; as to approue of that for very sound and christian doctrine, which (at the best) joyneth inherent righteousness as a necessary part at least to make vp justification? Although indeed the Papists allow of no other justification but that which is inherent. But take them in the best sense, as M<sup>c</sup> Cholmeley, the compound sense; to compound *Protestant justification with sanctification*, doth it not wholly ouerthrow justification by Christ? Read *Gal. 5. 2. 4.* See also *Truth triumph ouer Trent*.

Yet, for all this hee goes on, persists in his opinion, and sayth pag. 111. that although Gods people must come out of Babylon, yet not vpon that ground, that the Councell of Trent doth directly deny and ouerthrow the foundation. And so (sayth hee) I conclude, as I beganne, Apply *John Barber* and thou shalt haue a new pare of sissers.

*Reply.*

Now it is pitty, that in the vpshot of all, you haue no more variety of inuention, sith your tongue all along hath not failed to cut like a sharpe razor. But I suppose that since the other time that you were trimmed with *John Barber* sissers, the lockes of your maliciousnesse are growne so long againe, that they will need a new paire of sissers. Or seeing, you with your brother *Butterfield* haue pleaded so well for *Beldame Babell*, and her shaueling sons, if you purpose to bee of that Order and fraternitie, you may doe well to change your two paire of sissers, for two Razors,

to serue each of your turnes. For I finde not in either of  
your booke any thing, but *lippis dignum & consoribus*.  
But stay a little, and so cut of all together.

For he adds in his concluding leaf.

M. Cholm. ' Pag. 113. It is well obserued, that this fellow hath a  
notable dexterity in dedicating Epistles before his  
bookes, and in Prefaces, digressions, Epilogues, and the  
like, but that in his Tracts, Discourses, and disputations,  
he is as hungry and dry, as Famine it selfe. This, as it is  
true in all his writing, so especially in this, as I hope I  
haue in good measure made it appeare by the Premisses  
&c.

Reply.

This fellow? which fellow? your Aduersary M. *Burton* do you meane? Is it not hee to whom in your Epistle to mee, you were every way *eqnall*? *I am sumus ergo pares.* Onely I will not *par pari* referre. Methinkes I should not say, to a minister, and my equall, so contemptuously, *This fellow.* Or how growes the difference betweene vs? Because you haue a rich Benefice, and I a poore? Or because you plead for the Church of Antichrist, and I of Christ? Or because you defend a mans cause, and I Gods? Or because you hane pleaded a bad cause so well, and I a good, so ill? Well, what say you of this fellow? *It is well obserued.* By whom? But what? you seeme to compare all my poore workes to a proud Pharisee, or hypocrite, all faire without, but within a few dry-bones or dust, *hungry and dry, as famine it selfe.* Surely then in one thing you haue mette with mee: for though your Epilogue bee bitter, yet your Prologue, your Epistle to mee seemed to promise some ingenuity and Candor: but loe through the whole body of your Discourse, you feed my hunger and thirst with nothing but

but gall and vineger. Do you thus fulfill that of the A-  
postle, *If thine enemy hunger feed him, if hee bee dry gine  
him drinke?* What? with gall and vineger? But o-  
therwise you cannot heape hote coales vpon his head. Well  
But are all my bookeſ in the bulke, ſo hungry and dry?  
How proue you that? *This (ſay you) as it is true in all  
his writings, ſo especially in this.* Why, M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley, do  
you find in any of my writings any vifound doctriues,  
or rotten ſtuffe, ſuch as yours is full ſtuffed, yea ſtifted  
withall? But is this *especially* ſo? what if not ſo? But  
you hope you haue in good meaſure made it appeare by  
the Premiſſes. But whereon is your hope grounded? vpon  
appearances? you know you muſt paſſe the Cenſure of  
the judicious Reader, to whose vnpartiall iudgement  
you haue appealed. And beleeue it, they will not take  
appearances for ſubſtances. And to them I appeale  
too. Now what if this booke of myne proue not ſo hun-  
gry and dry, but full of ſuch ſtrong meate, as M. Cholm-  
ley ſtomacke is not able to digest? Will hee therefore  
caſt it in my diſh? Now all yee Reverend and Learned  
Fathers and Brethren, Fellow-labourers in this noble  
vineyard judge indifferently what in this waſhingy cauſe,  
hath beene, how ſlenderly ſoever, ſayd on truthe's be-  
halfe, and the L O R D giue you vnderſtanding in all  
things. What hath beene defective on my part, I  
humbly craue pardon for, and remitte the rest to bee  
perfected by ſome stronger Champion. Yet before I  
part with M. Cholmeley, let mee beſlow a few Syllogiſmes  
vpon him, leaſt hee ſhould altogether triumph for default  
of Logicke. I doubt I ſhall giue him more then hee can tell  
what to doe withall.

I will therefore ſume vp what I haue maniſtly proued  
againſt M. Cholmeley in this my Reply into formeſ Syllo-

gisticall, adding withall sundry other Arguments, all concluding the Church of Rome to be no true visible Church of Christ.

The first Argument from the definition of a true visible Church of Christ.

*Proposition.* The true visible Church of Christ, is a congregation of faithfull men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments bee duly administred according to Christ's Ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

*Assumption.* But the Church of Rome is not a congregation of faithfull men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administred, according to Christ's Ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

*Conclusion.* Therefore the Church of *Rome* is not a true visible Church of Christ.

The Proposition is the Church of Englands, Article 19.

The assumption also is proued by the second Sermon for Whit-sunday, where the preaching of the pure word of God, and the du administrations of the Sacraments according to Christ's institution, are denied to be in the Church of Rome.

Againe, that the Church of Rome is not a congregation of faithfull men is proued, because they want, they deny the sauing faith of Christ, as hath beene sufficiently proued before.

#### The second, Argument.

That church wherein saluation ordinarily, or by ordinary meanes cannot be hoped for, is no true visible church of Christ.

But in the Church of Rome saluation ordinarily, or by Ordinary meanes cannot be hoped for.

Therefore the church of Rome is no true visible church of Christ.

For the Proposition it is a Maxime, *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*

*In Salsus*; out of the church no saluation. necessarily implying, that saluation is onely to bee found in the Church; so that no saluation, no church of Christ: also that a true church of Christ must needs haue the ordinary meanes of saluation.

For the Assumption, it is proued diuers wayes: as the preaching of the Gospell, of the pure Word of God, is the onely ordinary meanes to beget faith vnto saluation, Rom. 10.14.15.17. Now the *Gospell, Word, and Faith of Saluation* is not permitted to bee preached or beleueed in the Church of Rome, as wee haue shewed. Wherevpon the learned *Chemnitius* sayth of the Church of Rome: *Infieldem ergo Ecclesiam, cui per Tridentinum Concilium non licet credere, predicare, vel docere illam beatitudinem hominis, testimonio Mosis, Davidis & omnium Prophetarum confirmatam &c.* O vnhappy and miserable church, for whom the councell of Trent decrees it vnlawfull to beleue, to preach, or teach that blessednesse of man, confirmed by the testimonies of Moses, of Dauid, and of all the Prophets! For the purpose, they may not preach or teach the sauing doctrines of saluation, as the *Justifying faith*, which is an affiance particular, and certaine *Justification by faith*, consisting in the sole imputation of Christis righeteouinesse, and the like.

### Argument 3.

That Church which overthroweth and denyeth the *Proposition*: only rule of faith, is no true Church of Christ.

But the Church of Rome overthroweth and denyeth the only rule of faith.

Therefore the church of Rome is no true church of Christ.

For the Proposition: the only Rule of faith is the Scripture or written word of God. Ioh.5.39.2. Tim. 3.16. Esa. 8.20. Now to overthrow this Rule, is to overthrow the foundation of the church of God, which is built vpon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, that is, vpon the

Scriptures.

*Chemnit. Ex. de Iustif. pag. 141. Printed at Frankf. 1578.*

Scriptures of the New and Old Testament.

For the Assumption: that the Church of Rome hath overthrown this Rule, it is evident: for first shee hath in the Church of Trent added another Rule of her owne, to wit, *Traditions* and humaine *Inventions*, which are Contrary to the Scriptures as Christ sayth *Math. 15. 16.* For Gods *Arke* and *Dagon* cannot stand together. Secondly they overthrow the Scriptures, the onely rule of faith, while they subiect the authority and sense of it wholly to the Church of Rome, or the Pope, so that Gods word is not received of the Church of *Rome*, as it is the word of God, but as the word of men; contrary to the Apostle, *1. Thess. 2. 13.*

#### Argument 4.

*Proposition.* The Church of Antichrist, is not the true Church of Christ.

*Assumption.* But the Church of Rome is the Church of Antichrist:

*Conclusion.* Therefore the Church of Rome is not the true Church of Christ.

For the Assumption Mr *Cholmley*, grants the Church of Rome to bee Antichristian; hee denies not the Pope to bee Antichrist. And therefore wee take it for granted.

But hee denies the Proposition, saying, that it may bee both the Church of Christ, and of Antichrist, both a whoore, and Christs Spouse. The absurdity whereof wee haue formerly confuted. Or if shee be Christs Spouse why doth shee not reduce the whoore to better order and conforimty? But hereunto I adde this Argument following for prooef of the former.

*Proposition.* The true church of Christ obeyeth not Antichrist as her head.

*Assumption.* But the Church of Antichrist obeyeth Antichrist as her Head.

*Conclusion.* Therefore the church of Antichrist cannot bee the true church of Christ.

All M. *Cholmleys* distinctions here canne take no place. For

for Christ expressly saith, *No man can serue two masters,* to wit, two opposite and contrary masters; *but either hee must leaue the one, and hate the other, or cleaue to the one, and forsake the other.* Now what two masters can be more opposite, then Christ and Antichrist? so that the same church, which obeyeth the Pope for her Head, is not subiect to Christ, as her Head, and therefore is not the church of Christ. If any man say, that the Pope is but a Ministeriall Head, subordinate to Christ, this is but a Popish colour, & meere shift; for both in doctrine and practise, the Pope is supreme and sole Head of the church of Rome, and so acknowledged, so obeyed, above, without, against Christ.

*Argument 5.*

That church, the Head and Members whereof goe into *Proposition.* perdition, is not the true church of Christ.

But the church of Rome, Head and Members, as at this *Assumption* day, goeth into perdition:

Therefore, the church of Rome is no true church of *Conclusion.* Christ.

For the Proposition, it cannot bee denyed, for that Ecclesiasticall body, the head and members whereof goe into perdition, cannot bee the true church of Christ, because the true church of Christ goeth not into perdition. Christ is the Sauiour of his body, his church, *Ephes. 5. 23.* And where the Head goes, there also goe the members: *Ioh. 14. 3. & 27. 14. 1. Cor. 15. 23.*

For the Assumption therfore; M. *Cholmeley* distingheth, and saith, that the church of Rome, is both a wife, and a whoore, and as a wife shee receiuers Grace from Christ, as a whoore Apostacie from Antichrist. Which distinction I might answere ( though answered before ) as a plaine Rusticke did the Arch-bishoppe of *Colen*, who seeing the Martiallike

Prelate accompanied with armmed men, begun to laugh. The Archbishop demanding of him why hee laughed: I laugh (quoth he) at S Peter Prince of Prelates, because he liued and dyed in pouerty, to leaue his successours rich. The Archbishop being nipp'd, and desirous to cleare him selfe, replied, that hee went with such a troupe, as hee was a Duke. Whereat the Pesant laughing lowder, then before, I would gladly S (quoth hee) know of you, where you think the Archbishop should bee, if the Duke, of whom you speake, were in hell. So I may say, if the Church of Rome, as shee is the great whore, goe to hell, what shall become of the Spouse, M Cholmeley speakes of?

*Proposition.*

*Arg. 6.*

That Church which holdeth not the Head Christ, is no true Spouse, or Church of Christ.

*Assumption.*

But the Church of Rome holdeth not the Head Christ.

*Conclusion.*

Therefore the Church of Rome, is no true Spouse, or Church of Christ.

The Proposition is vndeniable, *Eph. 4.16. & 5.23. Col. 1.18.*

The Assumption is proued: that the Church of Rome holdeth not the Head.

*Proposition.*

That Church, which is wholly idolatrous, holdeth not the Head:

*Assumption*

But the Church of Rome is wholly idolatrous, therefore the Church of Rome holdeth not the Head.

*Conclusion.*

The Assumption, not M Cholmeley I hope will deny.

The Proposition is proued by the Apostle, *Col. 1.18.19.* worshipping of Angels, being but one kinde of idolatry, separates from the Head: how much more all kind of idolatrie, wherein the Church of Rome is wholly drowned. And what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols? *2. Cor. 6.16.* And the name of an harlot cannot be withall a member of Christ. See *1. Cor. 15.16.17.*

Besides, shee adhereth to another Head, *ergo*, not to the one and onely true Head, Iesus Christ. See *Bellarmino de Ecclesiis*

*Ecclesia militante. lib. 3. cap. 9. & de notis Ecclesiae, cap. 10.*

*Arguments 7.* The true Church of Christ, is Christ's Virgin Spouse: *Proposition.*  
But the Church of Rome is not Christ's Virgin Spouse; *Assumption.*  
Therefore the Church of Rome is not the true Church *Conclusion.*  
of Christ.

The Proposition is the Apostles, *2. Cor. 11. 2.*

The Assumption is proved, because it is confessed euer of M Cholmeley himselfe, that the church of Rome is the whore of Babylon: and the same cannot possibly be both a whore, and a virgin Spouse.

Now though by this virgin Spouse bee meant the Elect of God, yet shee is knowne by the Matron-like habit of the profession of the trueth, and by openly disclayming & abhoring all filthinesse of flesh and spirit. So as that which Augustine said to the Synagogue of the Iewes, I may here apply to Babylon: *Non es Sponsa, quia non es integra. Non enim servas unius viro fidem, quia catholicam non tenes unitatem.* *Aug. contra Iudeos, cap. 12. tom 6.*  
*Hec est mater vera, pia mater & casta, intrinsecus sui viri dignitate ornata, non forinsecus mendacio fallente turpiter colorata.* And, *Caput & corpus Christus, & Ecclesia; nec ab illo separensur, aliud de illo, sicut heretici, credendo, nec ab ista, pravis nostris moribus declinando.*

*Argument. 8.*

The true church of Christ is the true flocke of Christ: *Proposition.*  
But the church of Rome is not the true flocke of Christ.

Therefore the church of Rome is not the true church of Christ. *Assumption.*

The Proposition is vndeniable. *Cant. 6. 6. Act. 20. 28. Conclusion.*  
*Job. 10. 16.*

The Assumption is proued, *Job. 10. 3. 4. 27.* Christ's flocke heare his voyce, and know it, and follow it. But the church of Rome heares not Christ's voyce, nor know, nor

acknowlede, nor follow it, but the voyce of Antichrist  
and of the Antichristian Synagogue. They heare not  
Christs voyce, as Christs voyce, but as the churches  
voyce, See Homilie for Whitsunday part. 2. D. 1595. ed. 1

### Proposition.

## Assumption.

## Conclusion.

The true church is the Kinges daughter, described  
Psal. 45. .S. 1. v. 3. *Now is thy Sonnes Day*

But the church of Rome is not the Kinges daughter, so described:

Therefore the church of Rome is not the true church of Christ.

The Assumption is proued: the church of Rome hath not one of those native qualities belonging to the Kings daughter. For first, the church of Rome doth not hearken and encline her eare to Christ, as wee haue proued. Secondly, shee doth not forget her owne people, and her fathers house, to wit, her Egyptian state, the kingdome of this world, and of Satan, the spirituall Pharaoh, but advanceth it all shee can, preferring it before the kingdome of Christ, which is not of this world. Thirdly, instead of Christ, the church of Rome acknowledgeth and worshippeth the Pope for her Lord God, as supreme ouer all. Fourthly, the church of Rome is not all glorious within, yea shee stands not vpon inward holines, but is all for outward glory, Pontifician honour, splendour and magnificence: as *Renel. 17*. All her inwards are filthy ragges, and rotteness, as *Esa: 64.6*. Note it well.

### Argument: 10:

**Proposition:** The true visible church of Christ is militant on earth.

**Assumption.** But the church of Rome is not militant on earth:  
**Conclusion.** Therefore the church of Rome is no true visible church  
of Christ.

The Proposition is vndeniable.

The Assumption is proved by the church of Romes Decretall. See *Sext: de electione cap. 17. lib. 1. ut ergo circa regimen, &c.* where is decreed a triumphat church here on earth, sitting as Queen in pulchritudine pacis, in Tabernaculæ fiducia, in temporalium requie opulencia: verifying that voyce of Babylon: *Rev. 18. Sedeo Regina, &c.* I sit a Queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. And this is established by irrefragable decree, and for euer to indure. See *Platina*, in the life of *Nichol.* the 3. which Pope excluded all imperiall power, and magistracy from bearing any office in Rome.

*Arg. 11.*

The church *Malignant*, is not the true church *Militant*. *Proposition.*  
*tant.*

But the church of Rome is the church *Malignant*.

Therefore the church of Rome is not the true church *Militant*. *Assumption Conclusion.*

For the Proposition: the church *Militant*, and the *Malignant*, are diametrically opposite, as the church of God, and Synagogue of Satan: as the two cities, whereof S<sup>t</sup> Aug. writ that noble 5<sup>th</sup> *Tome*.

For the Assumption, that the church of Rome is the church malignant, witnes *Revel. 17. 6.* witnes our Booke of Martyrs; witnes the Spanish Inquisition; witnes the Massacres in France, the story of the Waldenses, witnes the vastations in Bohemia, Morauia, Silecia, the Palatinate; and where not?

*Argument 12.*

An hereticall church is not a true church of Christ.

But the church of Rome, is an hereticall church:

Therefore not the true church of Christ.

*Proposition.*

*Assumption.*

*Conclusion.*

For the Assumptiō we all grant it, euē they that plead for the church of Rome, they confess it not to be an Orthodox church. Now if not an Orthodox church, how is it a true

church? yea what church in the world, was ever so hereticall, as that Synagogue of Rome is? It is the *Lerna, Asphalites*, and sinke of all pestilent heresies. See for this, the learned D *Whittakers* his collation of the present church of Rome, with the auncient Heretickes: *In fine Responsionis ad Demonstrationem Sandri*: See also the 3 conformities of Popery, written by *Francis de Croy*: specially the third conformity, wherein the church of Rome, is declared to symbolize with all, or most of the old Hereticks: besides the other two conformities in Gentilitme, and Judaisme. And for the Proposition, who will say, that an hereticall church is a true church? we speake not *de Ecclesia erratica*, but *heretica*: not of an erroneous church, but hereticall. Now an hereticke is hee, that is obstinate in his errore, that being conuinced, will not bee reclaimed, but persists, and labours to poyson others with his heresy, propounding it for sound doctrine. Such the Apostle warneth vs to avoyde, as being altogether subuerted, and condemned of his owne conscience. *Tit. 3.10.* Yea the church of Rome hath herein outstripped all heretickes that euer were, in that shee hath solemnly and irrefragably, and that against the cleare light of Gods word, and of her owne conscience, decreed all her hereticall doctrines to bee received, and the contrary trueths shee hath accursed.

*Argument. 13.*

*Proposition.* That church which is not *Catholick*, not *Apostolick*, not *one*, not *Holy*, is not the true church of Christ.

*Assumption.* But the church of Rome is none of these, not *Catholick*, not *Apostolick*, not *one*, not *Holy*:

*Conclusion.* Therefore the church of Rome, is no true church of Christ.

The Proposition is granted of all, being defined by the councell of *Constantinople*.

The Assumption is proued; first, themselues confess no other holinesse requisit to their church but the externall profession of the holines of their doctrine, and of their first founders,

ounders, which what it is, wee all know. Nor can they otherwise defend their definition of a church, as consisting of rotten members. Secondly, they would haue their church one, in regard of vnity of faith. Whence wee may inferre, that the church of Rome can bee called neither catholicke, nor Apostolick, vntesse it hold the catholicke and Apostolick faith. But the catholicke and Apostolick faith it holdeth not, for it hath not the intire rule of faith, nor the pare preaching of the word, nor the right and lawfull administration of the sacraments, obserued by the Apostles, and instituted by Christ. *Vide D VVhitaker, Controversie 2. Quest. 2. An Ecclesia Romana sit vera Christi visibilis Ecclesia: cap. 3.*

*Argument. 14.*

That church which ouerthroweth the maine & proper *Proposition.* causes of our Salvation, is no true church of Christ.

But the church of Rome ouerthroweth the maine and *Assumption* proper causes of our Salvation:

Therefore the church of Rome is no true church of *Conclusion.* Christ.

The Proposition no man will deny.

The Assumption is proved: For first, they haue ouerthrowne the principall and fundamentall Article of Iustification, which is the head and summe of all Religion. They erre in the efficient cause of our Iustification, which is the free favour and grace of God: this they deny, building it vpon mans merit of congruity, or preparatory and dispository workes to Iustification, &c. coupling it with mans free will. They erre in the materiall cause, Christ's obedience; this they deny to be our obedience, or the matter of our justification. They erre also in the forme of our justification, which is the imputation of Christ's righteousness vnto vs. They erre in the instrumentall cause of justification, to wit, the justifying faith, denying it to bee a certaine particular trust or assurance in Gods mercy for the pardon of our sinnes: Yea they erre in the very meritorious cause,

Christ

Christ the Redeemer, ouerthrowing all his offices infinite wayes, excluding an absolute necessity of Christ the Redeemer; for, saith the councell of Trent, *Si quis, &c.* If any man shall say, that all workes which are done before justification, in what regard soeuer they are done, to be truely sinnes, or to deserue Gods hatred, &c. let him be accursed. They erre in the finall cause of justification, being the free gift of eternall life, while they say, the same is merited by condignity. They ouerthrow the fundamentalls of certainty of Salvation, of the sufficiencie of Scriptures, for the rule of faith: of the necessity of the knowledge of the Scriptures for all the people of God; of the pure worship of God alone in spirit and trueth; of the right vse of the Sacraments, while vnto them they attribute grace, *ex opere operato, & intentione Sacerdotis, &c.* deny the true faith; of the trueth of Christ's naturall body by their Transubstantiation, as if made of a peece of bread; of the Article of Christ's sitting at Gods right hand in the heauens, while they keepe him in euery little box; of the Eucharist to be celebrated in both kindes, to be ministred to all the peoples; of the onely sacrifice of Christ once made; which they destroy by their propitiatory Masse, and of the one and onely Sacrificer Iesus Christ, who was both Priest, and Sacrifice, and Altar, and whom none could offer but Christ alone. Thus they ouerturne all the fundamentalls of Salvation. For, as for the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Deity simply considered (without Christ, the word incarnate) howsoeuer the church of Rome keepe it intire, yet that of it selfe, is no proper fundamentall of salvation. For though wee are not saued without it, yet by it alone we are not saued. For the saving knowledge of God is in Christ, and not *Extra Christum*, without Christ. *This is life eternall, to know thee, the onely true God, and whom thou hast sent, Iesus Christ.*

John. 17. 3.

*Argument. 15.*

That Church which is wholly Papall, is no true Church

of

of Christ.

But the Church of Rome is wholly Papall:  
Therefore it is no true Church of Christ.

For the Proposition, all Protestant Divines, euen those that plead for Rome, confess it. For the Assumptiō, it is no lesse true; though Romes Champions, as M<sup>r</sup> Butterfield distinguish betweene the Church of Rome, and the Court of Rome. But this distinction is wholly antiquated and abrogated in these dayes. Before the Councell of Trent, the distinction was of vse, as the reuerend Bishop of Chichester, D Carleton, hath well obserued: but now the whole church of Rome is turned into the court of Rome, and become wholly Papall. They are all head and taile, branch and rush, one intire Papall faction, all combining and confederating in the profession of the Tridentine faith, and practise of all the abominations established by it.

*Assumption.  
Conclusion.*

Arg. 16.

That church which hath not the true baptisme of Christ, *Proposition.*  
is not the true church of Christ.

But the church of Rome hath not the true baptisme of *Assumption.*  
Christ.

Therefore the church of Rome is no true church of Christ.

*Conclusion.*

The Proposition no man (I hope) will deny. The Assumption I proue: The church of Rome hath not the true baptisme of Christ.

True Baptisme is a seale of the righteousnesse of faith *Proposition.*  
and of the couenant of grace made vnto vs in Iesus Christ:

But the Baptisme in the church of Rome is not the seale *Assumption.*  
of the righteousnesse of faith, and of the couenant of grace,  
made vnto vs in Iesus Christ.

Therefore the Baptisme in the church of Rome is not *Conclusion.*  
the true Baptisme of Christ.

The Proposition is proued from the Apostle, Rom. 4.  
11. Baptisme being every way equiualent to circumcision,  
in whose stead it succeeded, as August. faith, and all ac-  
knowlede. The Assumption I proue; for the Church

of Rome denyeth the righteousnesse of faith, and the justifying faith, yea shee maketh baptisme the instrumentall caule of justificatiō, as that it conferres grace *ex opere operato*; and they require not faith in Christ, as necessary for

Concil. Trid.  
Sess. 7. De Sa-  
cramentis Can.  
6. & 8.

\* So as the Do-  
natis did hang  
the force of bap-  
tisme vpon the  
Ministers con-  
scientia sancte-  
dantis attendi-  
tur, qua ablat  
accipientis.

August. contra  
Cresconium. li.  
a. cap. 17.

the party to bee baptized, but a disposition; and principally the whole force of baptisme, and so of all their Sacraments, they hang vpon the \* Priests intention, as wee haue shewed else where. So as the Church of Rome hath no more of

Baptisme, but only the externall forme of words, together with the element of water: For, A Sacrament is a visible signe of an invisible grace, which invisible grace the church of Rome destroyeth, while she placeth the grace in the Sacrament it selfe: as Sess. 7. *de Sacramentis Can. 6.* denying and accursing onely faith in Gods promise to bee sufficient to receiue grace. Thus they destroy the nature and vse of Christ's Sacraments, and so of Baptisme in speciall, while they separate it from the doctrine of the word of God, and from the necessity of justifying faith. Thus that Church is quite remoued from the foundation, and built vpon another, a false foundation. Thus Baptisme to them of that Church, is nothing else, but a seale to a blanke, or which is worse, a sealing vp of their condemnation, while their sins are not washed, but their soules drowned, as the Egyptians in the red sea, a type of Baptisme. Yea they make a very Idoll of their Sacrament, and of the Priest together, while to theie they attribute that grace, which the onely Author and fountaine of true Baptisme canne giue. They present their children in the faith of that Church, which denyeth true faith in Christ.

*Obiection.*

Here an obiection is made: if the Church of Rome haue not the true baptisine of Christ, why then are not Papists, when conuerted to the true faith of Christ, rebaptized? how stands their former baptisine good?

*Answer.*

*Answeare.* S. Augustine speaking of the externall forme of August. contra Baptisme vsed among Heretickes, saith, that such baptisme Cresconii lib. is not to bee repeated but the errout of the Baptisme to be 1. c. 30. tom. 7. corrected.

corrected. To this purpose Bellarmine himselfe sayth,  
*Cumveniant ad Ecclesiam baptizati ab Hereticis, agnoscen-  
 dum est quod est Ecclesia. Baptisma, corrigendus vero error.*

*Aug. De Baptismo contra Donat. lib. 7. cap. 40. sayth, The Augustine.  
 divine Scriptures in many places do shew all those to be stran-  
 gers from the Church, who are not in the rocke, and appertaine  
 not to the members of the Dome, and yet to baptize, and to bee Sine salute Sa-  
 baptizad, and to haue without saluation the Sacrement of sal- cramentum sa-  
 uation. And sayth hee, Heretickes haue lawfull baptisme loris.  
 (that is for the exterrnall forme) but not lawfully. ib. lib. 5.c.*

17. And else where, Whence is so great vertue in the water, as  
 to touch the body, and to wash the heart, but because of the  
 word? *Non quia dicitur, sed quia creditur*, not because it is  
 vttered, but because it is beleueed. *This is the word of faith,*  
*And Act. 15. By faith purifying their hearts.* And Ephes. 5.  
*That he might sanctifie his Church, cleansing it in the Laver*  
*of water in the word.* Wherupon S. Aug. sayth, *Mundatio*  
*&c.* Then cleansing should not at all be attributed to the  
 fluid and slippery element, without this addition, in the  
 word. This word of faith (sayth hee) is not such force in the  
 Church of God, as by it beleueing, offering, blessing, dip-  
 ping, to cleanse the infant though, not yet able with the  
 heart to beleue to righteousness, and with the mouth to  
 confess to saluation. All this (sayth hee) is done by the  
 word of faith, and by the faith of the word. Now (as wee  
 showed) the Church of Rome, hauing in the Conccell of  
 Trent denied the faith of righteousness, and the righte-  
 ouesse of faith, the saving doctrine of Baptisme, she hath  
 consequently made Baptisme to bee of none effect to her  
 vnto saluation, but as S. Aug. sayth, of the Donatists, Penall  
 and pernicious. But now, when any papist is by the grace  
 of God, and the preaching of the word and of saving faith  
 conuerted to the true Church of God, the seale of baptisme  
 is not againe affixed, but the Evidence of saving faith, and  
 Testament of the Gospell being written in his heart, is now  
 added to the seale, and so it becomes compleat authentick,

as not being bound necessarily to outward meanes. Nor do we here exclude Gods free agencie in baptisme who in the infant baptizied in that hereticall church may (if it please him) worke grace finding his owne water, and his owne words; finding I say his owne scale, he can adde his couenant of grace vnto it, yet no child there baptizied comming to the yeares of discretion (vnlesse hee renounce the wicked faith, & relinquish the Idolatrous practise of that Romish church) can haue benefit by his baptisme; but to him it is penall and pernicious, as Aug. speakes.

*Argument 17.*

*Proposition.*

That church which hath not a lawfull Ministry, is not a true visible church of Christ.

*Assumption.*

But the church of Rome hath not a lawfull Ministry.

*Conclusion.*

Ergo, the church of Rome is not a true visible church of Christ.

The Proposition is granted of the Papists themselues. The Assumption I proue: The church of Rome, now especially since the Councell of Trent, hath not a lawfull Ordination, therefore not a lawfull Ministry. Not a lawfull Ordination, i in regard of the officient cause, either remote, as the Pope, as Head, whence all their Ministeriall power is deriued, or immediate, as the Ordainer, on whose *Intension*, their *gratia gratis data* dependeth. So that here is a nullity in the very foundation of the ordination of the Papall Ministry. It is deriued from the Pope, as Head of the clergy and Church, a tittle merely Antichristian and usurped, and so their Ministry is antichristian. And if the Pope, being Antichrist and an usurper, and consecrating Bishops by vertue of his Papall supremacy, as Christ's sole Vicar, and Peters successor cannot conuey any power of Order vpon his Bishoppes and clergy: what lawfull Ministry canne wee expect in that Apostolicall Synagogue?

So that *Calvin* pronounced of them, *Negosub toto Papaeclisis reformatâ. in unum esse vere Episcopum*. And if they haue not one true or truly a Bishop, what shall we say of their Priests. *Calvin*

*verso*

vera Ecclesie reformatio. Neither haue they any materiall grace, because it depends vpon their Ordainers Intencion, & not vpon Christs Ordinance, Grace & promise. 2<sup>ly</sup>, they faile in the Formall and finall cause of Ordination. They haue quite altered & corrupted the forme, & so the end of Ordination: for they haue added a new forme, which overthroweth the old, and which imposeth a new end, to wit, making the whole essence & vse of their Ministry to consist in Priesthood, in the sacrificing of an Idol, & turning the office of a Minister into an Idol-sacrificing priest. See their forme of Ordination, set downe in their Trents catichisme, *Pars secunda: De Ordinis Sacramento n. 23*: where (in Ordination) after imposition of hands with the signe of the crosse the chalice with wine, & the Paten with the Host is deliuered into the hand of the Priest now Ordained, with these words, *Accipe potestate offerenda sacrificium Deo, Missa q[ue] celebrans etā provinciis, quā pro defunctis &c.* Take thou power to offer sacrifice to God, & to celebrate Masses as well for the liuing as for the dead &c. And this, *precipua Sacerdotis functio existimanda est*, is to be esteemed the principall function of the Priest. *Ad extremū verū &c.* And in fine, imposing hands againe, Receive thou the holy Ghost: whose sins souer ye remit &c: *Eiūq[ue] Catechūlla &c.* And thus the Bishop giueth vnto the Priest that celestiall power of retaining and remitting sinnes, which the Lord gaue to his Disciples. So there. And wee know that this power of remitting & retaining sins, the Church of Rome placeth not in the dispensing & preaching of the word of God, but in their Sacrament of Penance. Thus they haue wholly perverted their ordination both for the formall, & finall end of it. They faile also in the materiall cause. For are made Priests ordinarily, but ignorant persons, such as are only able to mutuble ouer the Masse and Matins.

But some here object. That in Popish Ordination is conferred a power to preach the word.

I answer: that in Popish Ordination are vised those

word of Christ, which the Church of England vseth in Ordination, namely, receive the Holy Ghost, whose sinnes ye remit &c which wee indeed do vnderstand of the dispensation of the Word and Sacraments, but the Church of Rome otherwise, namely of the Priests power in binding and loosing, in their Sacrament of Penance. And it is in vaine for them to say, that their Priests in their ordination haue any power conferred vpon them to preach the word of God, when their practise is farre otherwise. Neither indeed is it lawfull for them so to preach the word of God, as it behoueth faithfull Ministers of the Gospell, to wit, purely and soundly, to the sauing of mens soules. For the pure and sound sauing doctrine of the word of God is branded for heresie in the Councel of Trent. Nor may their Bishops or Priests deliver the sense of it otherwise, then according to the Canons and Decrees of Trent, and the sense of the Church of Rome, as wee haue shewed. Yea the Councell of Trent it selte puts the matter past all aduenture; telling vs plainly, that those words in Ordination *Whose sins yee remit &c.* are not meant of the dispensation, or preaching of the Gospell, but of the power of binding and loosing in the Sacrament of penance. And for proofe hereof take the whole Canon, Sess. 14. Can. 3. *Si quis dixerit &c.* If any man shall say, that those words of our Lord and Saviour [Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sinnes yee remit, they are remitted, and whose sins you retaine, they are retained] are not to bee vnderstood of the power of remitting and retaining sins in the Sacrament of penance, as the Catholike Church hath from the beginning alwayes ynderstood: but shal wrest them, contrary to the institution of the Sacrament, to the authority of preaching the Gospell: let him bee Anathema. What need wee any more testimony? How justly then might Calvin, writing to the King of Poland, say of Roines Clergy, *Toruum Sacerdotium Papisticum non solum impia est veri Ministerij profanatio, sed execrabilis in Christum concumelia;* & *quisquis est Sacerdos papalis,*

papali, donec titulum illum abiecerit, Christi seruus esse nequeat: The whole Popish Priesthood is not onely an impious profanation of the true Ministry, but an execrable contumely against Christ: so as, whosoever is a Popish Priest, vntill hee cast away that tigle, hee cannot be Christ's seruant.

I conclude this with this Argument, taken from the definition of true Ordination.

True Ordination is a sacred institution of Christ, where-  
by the Person ordained is invested with a power to  
preach the word of God, and to administer the holy Sacra-  
ments, according to Christ's ordinance.

But the Ordination vsed in the Church of Rome, is not  
according to Christ's institution, to wit, whereby the per-  
son ordained is invested with a power to preach the word  
of God, and to administer the holy Sacraments, according  
to Christ's Ordinance.

Therefore in the Church of Rome there is no true Or-  
dination; therefore no true Ministry, therefore no true  
Church.

The Proposition is vndeniable, vntesse a more exact De-  
finition of true Ordination may haply bee giuen. The  
Assumption is already proued. For first, for administration  
of Sacraments; The Priests power is respectiuely and spe-  
cially limited to their Eucharist and Penance: Secondly,  
that Eucharist is a meere Idoll, and blasphemous sac-  
rifice, and no true Sacrament at all: Thirdly, the very  
words of Christ, vsed in true Ordination of all Orthodox  
Churches, which are vnderstood of dispensing the word  
and Sacraments, the Church of Rome perverteth and wre-  
steth to absolution, meant of a power of dispensing the  
word of God, which sense ( saith Trents Canon ) is  
wrested contrary to the Institution of this Sacrament  
( of Penance ) to the authority of Preaching the Gos-  
pell.

But here comes in a second objection; if in the Church Objection  
of

of Rome there bee not true and lawfull Ordination, why then, when any of their Priests are converted to the true faith and Church of Christ, are they not reordained?

*Answer.*

Although their Ordination were altogether vnlawful & vnwarrantable, according to the institution of the Church of Rome: yet comming to vs of the true Church after the pairing and shauing off of their power of sacrificing, and of Sacramentall binding and loosing, and penance, and restorung to the word of Christ (profaned and abused by them to a wrong sense), their originall true meaning and sense; while the Priest converted openly renounceth the Masse, and all that abominable Sacrifice, taking the Oath of Supremacy, and subscribing to the Articles and Doctrines of the Church: they are herevpon received, and their Ordination now stands good, which before was vicious and Antichristian, as in the case of baptisme before. See M. *Francis Mason* his booke of Ordination. *lib. 5. cap. 12.* in the end of that worke: The same reason is to be giuen of the Ministry of the Church of England, which in times past was deriu'd & descended from that Antichristian Church.

Thus hauing shewed that in the Church of Rome there being no true and lawfull ordination of Ministry according to Christ's institution, but that they are ordained to be Idolatrus Priests, offring that waffer Idol vpon sacrifice which them selues haue made, this being the principall part of their Priestly function, and to which their whole seruice is referred. We conclude that the Church of Rome is no true visible Church of Christ.

But before we make an end, some objections more (being moued by our Antagonists, and Romes Champions, as one M. *Butterfield*, a young man of good hopes, if the want of preferment do not draw him to lecke to make vp the mouth of his hopes, with the maintaining of bad causes) are to bee remoued; but briefly; because the maine dint, of what may bee more objected is already cleared, as falling in coincidently with M. *Cholmleyes* Arguments.

Ob.

Ob. Wee must distinguish betweene the Church of Rome, and Babylon in the Church.

The Church of Rome, now since the councell of Trent, is all Babylon; it is wholly a Papall faction, and confederacy. The Spirit of Iesuitisme derived from, and founded in the councell of Trent, or rather in hell, domineereth and swayeth everywhere. The Kingdome of *France* indeed, stood out at the councell of Trent, but where about? For matter of doctrine? No such thing: but in some points of Prerogative, as the power of Collation and Investiture of Ecclesiastick Promotions, & the like. But in all Trent-Doctrines and Decrees, the Sorbonists haue yeelded vnamious assent, and we know too well, that *France* is wholly swayed by the Iesuiticall generation. So that all Papists and Popish states, doe admit of, and yeeld to the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, as the rule and square of Faith and doctrine.

Ob. 2. The Church of Rome is as a diseased body onely, which though never so corrupt, yet is a true body still. As he is a true man, to whom the definition of a man agreeth, indued with a reasonable soule, though his body bee never so much diseased, as with Plague or Leprosy.

*Answe.* Many deceiue themselues with this comparison. They should first prouethe Church of Rome to be a liuing Church, before they can properly compare the body of it to the body of a liuing man. Els it is a begging of the question. For I deny the Church of Rome to be an Organical body, to wit, a liuing body. It is a meere dead corrupt carcase. And as a dead corrupt corps is not an organical body, as wanting the soule to actuate it, & so cannot be called truely a man, or a mans body, but a corps: no more is the Church of Rome, (being no lesse dead, then diseased) a true Church, as Aristotle noteth, A dead member to be but equivocally a meber: as *Bellarus* also confesseth of Romes mebers. Neither will it follow, that because there may bee an hidde Church of God within the borders of the Church of Rome: that therfore the Church of Rome is a true & visible Church.

For if any among them bee of the number of Gods sacred ones before their effectuall calling, they are members of that Antichristian Church, but being called: they are no more of it, but in it, and their being in it, will neuer proue it a true Church.

Object. 3.

Ob. The Church of Rome is no worse, then the Churches of Judah and Israel, when they were corrupted with Idolatry, or when they were in the worst estate: but euen in that estate they were the Churches of God: and why not aswell the Church of Rome?

Answer. The Church of Rome, as now it standeth, since the Councell of Trent, is infinitely worse, and more corrupted, then euer was either the Church of Iuda, or of Israel vnder the revolted Kingdome of *Jeroboam*, and his successors. And that in these regards: 1. because in the most deplored times of these Churches, God failed not to send his Prophets earely and late to admonish and teach them. They had the Ministry of the Word of God to direct them, yea and miracles alio to draw them, as 1 King. 18 &c. And this word was not without effect: for in the daies of *Elias*, euen within the lists of that revolted Kingdome vnder wicked *Ahab*; God had reserved his 7000, that had not bowed the knee to *Baal*. Thus God kept and continued his Church in those worst times; But where is there one Prophet or Preacher in the Church of Rome, that in these dayes, doth or dare preach the pure Word of God, or reprocure the base and abominable Idolatries of the Church of Rome, and the infinite corruptions of that kingdome of Antichrist? Where is there one *Savonarola* left? Both not the Inquisition, and *Index Expurgatorius* bush all true Prophets, and Prophecyings in that Church? Or where haue they (for all their lying bragges) any one true Miracle? Secondly, the corruption, Idolatry, and errors in those Israelitish Churches were onely *de facto*, but not *ex decreto*, they were not solemnly ratified by Decrees and Canons. But the horrible abominations in the Church of

Rome.

Rome, are not only of practise, but they stand vpon irrefragable Decrees and Canons, and that vnder most direfull Anathema, to be obserued of all, as the inviolable and perpetuall rule of their religion. Thus did Israel neuer, for any thing we read in Scripture. Onely *Ieroboam* by his perswasion allured and drew his people away by a great Apostacy to their vtter confusion at length. Yet a long time God had a hidden Church among them. And besides, we must euer put a difference betweene those two Kingdomes of *Inda* and *Israel*, at least wise for the Temple, Arke, Sacrifice, Priests and Leuites sakes. Thirdly, the Bookes of *Moses* were still in force for their authority, as the rule of faith neuer altered, although for a time intermitted and neglected in corrupt times: but the Church of Rome hath robbed the Scriptures of their diuine authority, restrained their native sense to the censure of the Church, and quite ouerthrowne them, by adding a new rule of faith. Thus neuer did the Church of *Inda* & *Israel* in their most forlorne estates.

Fourthly, All those that adhered to *Ieroboams* Idolatry in worshipping the calues, could expect no other, but damnation, without repentance; according to the Apostles sentence, *No Idolater, &c. shall enter into the Kingdome of Heauen*. To prevent which, G O D hath referued to himselfe 7000 that were no Idolaters, that bowed not the knee.

The Church of Rome hath onely added to the foundation, not taken away, or subtracted from it: and the nature of an addition, is not directly to deny, but by consequence at the most.

*Answer.* We haue already proued, that they haue destroyed the Foundation, and that both by Subtraction, and Additions; as their Traditions and Decrees quite ouerthrow the Foundation of Scriptures. For if the Scriptures affirme one thing, and Traditions another, these are obeyed, those rejected. And doe not Additions directly ouer-

throw? What say you to invocation of Saints? doth it not directly ouerthrow the pure worship of God, and faith in him alone? Doth not the Mass directly ouerthrow the one and onely Sacrifice of Christ once made? And so in the rest. For Additions being contrary and contradictory to the Foundation, *posito uno tollitur alterum*, the one being put, takes away the other. Againe, they haue sacrilegiously subtracted, and that directly from the foundation, as from the authority of Gods Word, as the only Rule of faith, and infallible Judge of controversies; from the Sacrament, by taking away both the cup, and the bread; from sauing faith, by denying it the natvie & genuine properties, & the like. Yea Addition only were sufficient to ouerthrow the foundation. Did not the Addition of circumcision among the *Galatians*, ouerthrow the foundation, to wit, justification by Christ? Read *Gal. 5. 2, 3, 4*. See also the learned and reverend D Featly his writ of errour; in his *Pelagius Redivivus*.

Againe, M Butterfield mistakes the word [*Directly*], as vnderstanding all along for [*Expressly*.] The Church of Rome doth not in expresse termes perhaps, or *totidem verbis* deny, but *directly* shee doth, and that by direct and necessary consequence, yea by direct and expresse contradiction in many things. And *direct* and *necessary consequence* is sufficient to proue their direct denyall of the foundation.

*Obiect. 5.* It is the judgment of many learned Protestant Diuines, that the Church of Rome is a true Church.

*Answe.* Although we haue answered this before, yet we will here adde a word or two, to cleare all scruples. First; all learned Protestant-Diuines doe not say so, for I can bring as many, & as learned, that are of the contrary judgment. Secondly, if those Authors, that seeme to allow the Church of Rome for a Church, bee but rightly vnderstood, and reduced to their owne Principles, they will bee found of this minde with the Church of *England*, that

the

the Church of *Rome* is no true Church of Christ: Let *Ianuarius*, so often and strongly urged by *Rome's* Champions, suffice for instance: who though indeed hee say much, and too much, and more then ever he either can, or doth proue, (for all his distinctions & qualifications are without book, having no more authority, but *Ipse dixit*, without any demonstration) yet being reduced and limited to his owne Principles, and Premisses, he must needes yeld to the contrary conclusions. For first he sets downe three proper and principall markes of the true and visible Church of Christ, to wit, first, the *Administration or dispensation of the word of salvation, out of the holy Scripture & the unchangeable rule of faith*. Secondly of the *Sacraments*, which God hath annexed to the *Word*, that *Ministers may deliver the same so as they haue received of the Lord, 1 Cor. 11*. And thirdly, the *observation of discipline in government and manners, &c.* Againe, The principall parts (faith hee) are *Pastors and Congregations, or Flocks*, delivering and receiving the saving word of life; of the combination of which parts, the whole body of the Church is compacted in the unity of the divine Spirit and Word. *Hac compositio &c.* This composition or coagmentation of the exterrall forme is rightly called a *Note of the Church*, whereby we acknowledge it from the sacred Scriptures, and the light of Gods Spirit; So, as the *Lord inhabiting in his Church, hath commanded it so to be constituted, and discerned from others.* Horum alterum si deest, Ecclesia esse definit. Sin utrumque deest, recte Ecclesia dicenda est: If either of these bee wanting, it ceaseth to bee a Church, but if both, bee there it is rightly called a Church. So *Ianuarius*. Now these grounds being layde, without which a true Church cannot bee, or be discerned: how can it bee inferred, that the Church of *Rome* is a true visible Church of CHRIST, seeing it wanteth these proper and peculiar markes of a true Church? Nor doth *Ianuarius* show any-where, that the Church of *Rome* hath these Notes and Markes.

Nor are there any Protestant Divines, but acknowledge those markes to bee necessary to know a true Church of Christ by, which if they bee wanting, it ceaseth to bee a Church, in *Aug.* his opinion, yea and in all sound Protestant's opinions, seeing it ceaseth to be a true visible Church of Christ. If then no Church can be a true visible Church without these proper markes, which all Protestant Divines approve: then how can the Church of Rome bee a true visible church of Christ, which is destitute of these Markes? And that it wants these Markes, witnesseth the Church of *England* in her Doctrines: as Homily for Whit-sunday, part. 2. where the church of Rome is by many markes proued and concluded to bee no true church of Christ.

First it wants these true and proper Markes of a true Church: For neither are they built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Iesu, neither doe they order the Sacraments, or els the Ecclesiasticall Keyes in such sort, as hee did first institute and ordaine them, &c. And there *Aug.* his argument is alledged: Whosoever doe dissent from the Scriptures concerning the Head although they bee found in all places, where the Church is appointed; yet are they not in the Church: a plaine place, concluding directly against the church of Rome. Againe, they want the Spirit of God. If it be possible to bee there, where the true Church is not, then is it at Rome. Againe, Hee that is of God, heareth Gods Word: whereof it followeth, that the Popes in not hearing Christ's voyce, &c. doe plainly argue to the World, that they are not of Christ, nor yet possessed with his Spirit. And much more to this purpose there, to which I referre the Reader.

Now as I haue vindicated this Homily of my Mother Church from the corrupt glosse of *M. Cholmley*, with who also *M. Butterfield* jumps, *fratres in malo*: so let me conclude all this discourse, with adding a word or two in defending & clearing our Church about the foresaid markes,

nibbled

nibbled at by M. Butterfield. For as for his aspersions and vilifications of my person, his taunts and scotches, I passe them by, considering them as sparkles leaping out of the boyling brest of juvenile ardour, and youthfull petulancy, as having gotten licence vnder Scale to insult ouer his betters; as if hee could not gratify his Lord, but by vilifying his brother; But I trust either Gods grace, or time and experience will qualify and temper, and reduce to better conformity such exorbitances.

Now first, M. Butterfield (pag. 83) may know, that I doubt not, but the Homilies doe containe sound doctirines of our church. If hee had reade my Plea to the Appeale, hee would haue vnderstood the reason of these wordes, if the Homilies containe any part thereof. For others doubted of it, not I. Againe, hee must remember, that the question is, not simply and strictly of a church, but of the true church of Christ; visible; In the demonstration whereof, the foresayde markes are requisite. Thirdly, the church of England there, speakes not of the church of Rome; as taking advantage, as if the injury of an age, or so, had imposed a present necessitie of interruption in the Word of GOD and Sacraments, according to CHRISTs Institution, but it speakes of an inveterate disease, which for so many hundred yeares had corrupted the state of that Church, which now was growne incurable. For who denyes but the church of GOD may for a time suffer an Eclipse, or interruption in the ordinary publicke ministratiōn of the Word and Sacraments, and yet bee a true church still? But take these publicke markes quite away, and where is the visibilitie of the church?

In Elias his time, GOD had a church in the Apostatized Kingdome of Israel, 7000, &c: but it was not a visible church; Elias saw it not, for hee saide, I am left alone. In the wildernes also the vse of circumcision was restrained, but that was in case of necessitie, for which they cea-

sed not to be a true visible Church, hauing the Ministry of the Word, the Law among them, the Arke, &c. But with the Church of *Rome* it is farre otherwise: they haue rejected and corrupted the Word of God, and that by solemn Decree and Canon irrevocable, they haue ouerthrowne the rule of Faith, so as they are no longer built vpon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, as our Church saith. And if this were true then, which was but about the time of the councell of Trent: how much more now?

But, saith M. *Butterfield*, This argument alledged ( of our Churches Markes) concludes affirmatiuely, not negatiuely, that where these markes are, there is a Church: not where they are not, there is no Church.

How? Affirmatiuely, not negatiuely? Yes, negatiuely also, and that, not onely by consequence, but expressly also. First, Expressly our Church concludes negatiuely, as we haue shewed. And secondly, by necessary consequence infallibly; for our Church speakes by way of definition of a Church, describing it by the proper markes; now a definition we know, is exclusive and negative, in regard of that to which it is opposed, as *Propriam quarto modo*; which I hope M. *Butterfield* hath not so soone forgotten, hauing bin but the other day, a Junior Sophister.

But to conclude and summe vp the verdict of all sound Protestant Divines vpon this point.

That Church which all sound Protestant Divines without exception, deny to haue the proper and essential marks of a true Church, is by their verdict, consequently no true visible Church of Christ.

But all sound Protestant Divines, without exception, deny the Church of *Rome* to haue the proper and essential marks of a true visible Church.

Therefore the Church of *Rome* is by the verdict of all sound Protestants concluded to bee no true visible Church of Christ.

Againe,

Againe, what one found Protestant doth say, that the church of Rome is a *true Church*? A church, some say; but not a *true Church*. No not *Innius*, the most vexed and quoted Authour about this point. Note it well: *Innius* his question is, *virum Ecclesia Romana Papalis, sic Ecclesia*. And he concludes, *Quia Papalis, &c.* As it is Papall, it is no church. Which opposite branch of his distinction, our common quoter smoothly and clearely leauue out, contenting themselves with the former branch, which seemes to smile vpon them. But we haue proted, that the present churh of Rome is wholly Papall. Therefore no church, vntesse ~~any~~, which may denominate the Antichristian church.

But M. *Butterfield* confesseth, that Gods word is not purely taught in the church of Rome, &c. yet hee addeth a qualification; *Neither can wee thinke* ( saith hee) *but that they are much sounder in their sermons, then in their dis-putations.*

And why, I pray you, can you not thinke otherwised? But if zeale ( M. *Butterfield*) had carried you to that Popish Sermon, in the Blacke-Friers, vpon that their dismall fifth of November, and you had escaped away with a broken legge, or crasht arme, or so, you might then, past thinking, feelingly & experimentally haue certified & pacified vs, what sound notes the Iesuite deliuered for the edification, or building vp of mens soules, when through the remarkeable judgement of God, hee pulled downe an old house vpon his owne, and hearers heads, *in perpetuam rei infamiam*. Otherwile, M. *Butterfield*, doe not thinke, that wee will bee so easily perswaded by your bare thinking; although *wee must*, say you. And why may you not as well thinke, that their *sermons*, are as vnsound, as their *disputations*? why should you not thinke, that a wolfe is a wolfe, as well when he preyeth vpon the sheep, as when he quarrelleth with the sheepheards dog? Or haue you bin at any time bitte by such wolues in *disputatio*, that you should hope they will deale better with you in their

Q

sermons?

sermons ? A wolfe is a wolfe though hee come in a sheepe's skinne. And of such, Christ warnes vs to beware. Beware then, M<sup>r</sup> *Butterfield*, you doe not befoole your owne simplicity, or blind charity, as to beleiue, or make any of your simple Readers imagine, that a wolfe in a sheepe's skinne, will not be so cruell to the sheepe, as in his owne to the dogge.

But, for the Sacraments, it is true( saith he) they haue defiled the Ordinances of God, with their indecent rites; yet can they not hereby make them nullities, much lesse by their erroneous opinions evanuate the force of them. It is well that M<sup>r</sup> *Butterfield's* youth, may plead for a pardon of his simplicity. Hee findes nothing amisse in the church of Romes depraving, or defiling the Sacrament, *but a few indecent Rites*. Well: what more? Their Baptisme, for the substance of it, is holy, and good, and effectuall( no doubt) to them that receiue it, as ours! Nay bate an ase. But this wee haue confuted before, about Baptisme. But what saith hee of their Eucharist? *The Euecharist is to them that partake of it ( if they bee worthy receiwers) a true Sacrament, notwithstanding their teachers opinion of Transubstantiation.* That they are debarred of the Cup in the holy Communion, is the sacrilege of the Ministers of that Synagogue, and the want thereof shall not be prejudiciale to those, that unfainedly desire it, &c. If our Mother Church doe not all the sooner chastise this her young sonne, or at least, chatechise him better in the Principles of Religion, shoo may bee in great danger to loose him, as being already possest with a strong erroneous conceit of Popery, vniessle in the last place some preferment stay him, which yet were the way to harden him in his errour, and to hearten him to goe on in such a thriuing course, in case some good benefice, or prebend bee conferred vpon him, for this his good service. And truely, for my part, I did not thinke it possible, there had beeene any one Minister of the church of England, so rude in the rudiments of his religion, whose religion is not grounded

vpn

Upon worldly respects, as to vtter such an vnflowud, vnsavory speech as this. And where will he finde one worthy Receiuer in the church of Rome, that is not perswaded, he eates his God, flesh, blood, and bones, in the Host? How is it then a true Sacrament? Nay, is it not a *meere* figment, an *Idol*, a *nothing in the world*? If it then haue not the nature of a Sacrament, sith the element is destroyed: how can it haue any Sacramentall force or efficacie? Or how can a blind Idolator, bee a worthy Receiuer, when all the faith required of him, is to beleue a nullity of the bread, and carnall reality of Christ's body, instead thereof? And will not God lay this to the Idolatrous peoples charge? Not at all? This is a pretty incouragement for simple Papists to continue in their Idolatry, so they doe but vnfainedly desire the cup in the Eucharist. But will their desire of a drop of wine, profit them more, then Dives his desire of a drop of water to coole his tongue? For what other desire can they haue, but carnall, when they belieue, that in the cup to bee no wine, but blood? But till they desire, as they should doe, which is by faith to hunger and thirst after Christ, which onely maketh them worthy receiuers: will not God (trow you M<sup>r</sup> Butterfield) lay this to your charge, that you so dawbe and varnish ouer an abominable Idoll, as if it were Gods sacred Ordinance? Can you so lightly passe ouer Transubstantiation, and the sacriledge of the cup, as if they were but some *undecent rites, that only defile, but nullifie not, nor evacuate the force of the Sacrament*? But, *as the man is, so is his strength*. And as the King of Israel pursuing the Moabite, and seeing him desperately to goe sacrifice his eldest sonne, returned in indignation, and pursued no farther: So I will here stint my pursuite, crauing leaue, to leaue the battell, when I see the Aduersary so hard driuen, as to offer vp his eldest sonne, even reason it selfe, if not soule and conscience and all, as a sacrifice to the Idoll.

<sup>2</sup> King. 3.

Wee will close vp all, with one Objection more, which *Objection. 6.*

Q<sup>2</sup> is

is made in the behalfe of the church of Rome: How can the church of Rome but be a true church of Christ, when it is said, that Antichrist sitteth in the Temple of God, & when wee say, that the Pope is Antichrist?

*Answeare.*

*Aqu. in 2. Thes. 2.*

Answeare. That the Pope is Antichrist, I wonder any Diuine should question, that knowes the Scriptures. That Antichrist is said to sit in the Temple of God, as God, this being rightly vnderstood, doth not onely proue the Pope to bee Antichrist, but the church of Rome the church of Antichrist, and not the church of God. For first to sit, doth signifie to raigne and rule. So *Augustine* and

*Aquin.us.* It is Babylons voyce, *Sedeo Regina, I sita* Queene. And it is a phrase proper to the Pope, none is saide to sit, (that is papally to raigne) but hee. Such a Pope sate to long, saith *Platina*, vsually. *Hee sits as God, not God simply, but as God, that is, Vice-Deus, Vice-God.* It is very remarkeable, which *Platina* obserueth, that *Boniface 3.* who first vsurped the title of Antichrist, to bee vniuersall Bishop, was the first Pope, that gaue this Motto, *Volumus & Inbemus, Wee Will, and Command.* Here began the Popes raigne. Thus Antichrist raignes.

Where, or ouer whom? *In the Temple of God.*

*Augustine* tels, that many in his time expounded it, for, or, *Instead of the Temple of God, as if Antichrist himselfe were* the Temple of God. And is not the Pope *instar Ecclesie,* the church collectiue and representatiue in himselfe? *Origen* before him saith, that some before him expounded the Temple of God, of the Scriptures; as the Pharisees were said to sitte in *Moses chaires*, to wit, the doctrine of *Moses Law.* And doth not the Pope beare rule ouer the Scriptures? The vncertaine Authour vpon *Matthew,*

*In cap. Mar. 24. faclm 49.* saith vpon these wordes, *When yee shall see the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place:* “ that is, saith hee,

“ When yee shall see wicked heresie, which is the hoast of Antichrist, standing in the holy places of the church, then let them which are in Iudea, flie to the Mountaines; that

*Aug. de Civit.*  
*Dei, lib. 20. c. 19.*

*Origen in Mat.*  
*Tract. 27.*

*In cap. Mar. 24. faclm 49.*

¶ They which are in Christianity, let them betake them to the Scriptures: For as a true Iew is a true Christian, as *Rom. 2. 29.* so true Iudea, is Christianity. Now the Mountaines are the Scriptures of the Apostles and Prophets, whereof it is said, Her foundations are vpon the holy hills. And why doth hee charge at this time all Christians to hane recourse to the Scriptures? Because in the time of Antichrist, Christians, who are desirous to know the verity of faith, haue no other refuge but the holy Scriptures. Because all those thinges, which are properly Christs in trueth, the same hath heresie in a type. They haue Churches, the Scriptures, Baptisme, the Eucharist, Bishops, and other Orders. Now in such a confusion, how is it possible, to know the true church, but by the Scriptures? If, as true Christians, wee woulde retaine the firmenesse of true faith. They that doe otherwise shall perish, because they cannot know the true church. So he. Which how pregnant & cleare a Prophecy it is of the present state of the Antichristian church of Rome, all men do see.

In a word, The Temple of God here, wherein Antichrist is said to sitte, is taken either materially, for the publicke place of divine worship, or mystically and spiritually, for the church of God, & the members of Christ, who are called the Temples of God. If materially, it signifies, that Antichrist doth usurpe those places for his Idol service, & Antichristian religio, which formerly had bin dedicated to Gods pure worship, and which now no otherwise retaine the name of the Temple of God, then Bethel did \* of \* *Gen. 18. 19.* olde, when *Ieroboams* golden calfe was erected in it, vwhich turned *Bethel* into *Bethauen*, the house of *Amos. 7. 13.* God into the house of iniquity. Secondly, if wee take *Ose. 4. 15.* the Temple of God here mystically and spiritually, for the true church of Christ, and his liuing members, though it bee true, that Antichrist hath no power ouer them, yet wee all know, that hee challengeth and usurpeth a

Extravag. v-  
nam sanctam.

Soveraigne power ouer the faith, the soule, the conscience of all Christians; that *it is of the necessity of Salvation for every creature to be subject to the Pope*, is the Popes owne Decree, so famous and well knowne. Thus *he sits as God in the Temple of God*. Doth hee therefore indeede beare rule in, and ouer Gods Saints, those liuing Temples? Or are those the liuing Temples, in, or ouer whom hee sitteth, that is, raigneth by his plenary power? No such thing. But this Antichrist assumeth, usurpeth, challengeth, boasteth of. As the Apostle addeth. *et regnatur id est in eius demonstrating, or shewing himselfe, that hee is God*, invested in all divine power and authority ouer the church. And doth not the Pope monopolize, and Catholickise ( as I may so say ) the church of Rome, to wit, all those Congregations, that adhere to him, as members to the Head, as the onely Catholicke Church ouer the earth, as the onely *Temple of God*, wherein hee sitteth and domineereth? Doth he not make shew and ostentation hereof, that he is the onely *as such, As God, or Vice-God, that sitteth, that raigneth in the Temple of God*? Doth hee allow any other Temple of God, but where himselfe sitteth? Doth hee not deny Salvation to all, who are not in and of this Temple? And doth he not sitte, supreme Judge in the tribunall of euery mans conscience and faith, ouer whom hee hath usurped Headship? Is not one of his chiefe merchandizes, *the soules of men*, which he disposeth of at his pleasure? so as, though he carry millions of soules with him into hell, to bee with himselfe tormented of the great Devill, yet none must troule him, or say, *why doest thou so?* As his owne Decretals say.

Now from that which hath beene said of Antichrists sitting in the Temple of God, I collect this conclusiue Argument.

That Temple, wherein the Pope, or Antichrist raigneth, as in the onely Temple of God, is not the true Church of Christ visible.

Proposition.

But

But the church of Rome is that Temple wherein the *Assumption.*  
Pope, or Antichrist now reigneth, as in the onely Temple  
of God:

Therefore the church of Rome is not the true church of *Conclusion.*  
Christ visible.

The Assumption no man will deny, vntesse hee that  
denyeth the Pope to bee Antichrist. But it skils not, so he  
grant the Pope there to raigne which hee cannot denie.

The Proposition I proue: By true church of Christ, is  
meant, either the Catholike Church, or a member and  
branch of it, as a particular church of Christ visible: but  
that Temple, wherein the Pope sitteth and reigneth, as in  
the onely Temple of God, is neither the Catholike  
Church, nor a true member and branch of it visible: there-  
fore it is no true church of Christ. That the church of  
Rome is the catholike church, all sound Protestants  
deny, that it is a member only of the catholick, the church  
of Rome denyeth, shee will be all, or none. And seeing shee  
will bee all or none, shee must needes be none at all.

Againe, that the church of Rome is not the catholike  
church, I proue it:

That church, which necessarily is affixed and appropri- *Proposition.*  
ated to one place, is not the catholike church.

But the church of Rome is necessarily affixed and ap- *Assumption*  
propriated to one place:

Therefore it is not the catholike church.

The Proposition is proued, *Ioh. 4. 23. Mar. 13. 21.*  
*Mat. 28. 19. 20. Act. 10. 35.*

The Assumption the Papists assume to themselues. For  
the foundation of that church is laid vpon the Romane  
mountaines; vpon *Peter*, Bishop of Rome, say they; so that  
if *Peter* proued never to haue beene at Rome, farewell the  
church of Rome. It ceaseth to be a church, if Rome be not  
the only Metropolis, Lady, and Mistresse of the world, and  
denominate the catholike church, the Romane catholike  
church. This is that great mysticall Babylon. This is that

*Conclusion.*

*Roma*

*Roma eterna*, the name of blasphemy written in the forehead of the purple whoore, as S<sup>t</sup> Hierome speakes. This then is the infallible marke of the false church, of that whoore of Babylon, challenging to her selfe the sole title and interest of the whole, to be solely called the Catholick Church, out of which is no Salvation.

*Proposition.*

Againe: That church, which challengeth to be the only Temple and church of God, excluding the true and Orthodox churches of God, as false & heretical, which acknowledge not her for their Head and Mistresse, is no true visible church of Christ.

*Assumption.*

But the church of Rome is such: shew challengeth to be the onely Temple and church of God, excluding the true and Orthodox churches of God, as false and heretical, which acknowledge not her for their Head and Mistresse.

*Conclusion.*

Therefore the church of Rome, is no true visible church of Christ.

The Assumption is evident.

The Proposition is no lesse cleare. For, any particular church, as that of Rome, challenging to bee the onely church, and excluding all Orthodox churches as false and heretical, which acknowledge not her for their Metropolis and Mistresse, is a proud, schismatycall, and Apostaticall church, and so remaining an obstinate Hereticke, and schismatycall, hath no communion with the catholike church of Christ, or with any the branches of it. And any church, which excludeth Orthodox churches as false and heretical, & that, not only for not acknowledging her for their Metropolis & Mistresse, but because they maintain & profess the saving truth of Christ: is not onely an egregious Schismatycall, but a notorious Heretick, \* indecreeing super forma iuramenti professing the saving doctrines of Christ for heresie, and decreeing ramenti professing the contrary. Now all fidei. this the church of Rome doing, proclaimeth her selfe to witnesse also the whole Councell of Trent.

\* Bulla Pii 4. indecreeing super forma iuramenti professing the saving doctrines of Christ for heresie, and decreeing ramenti professing the contrary. Now all fidei. this the church of Rome doing, proclaimeth her selfe to witnesse also the whole Councell of Trent.

incorrigible, and notorious schismatike vnreconcilable.

Whence I conclude.

No Church that is obstinately schismatall, damnable hereticall and Apostatall, vnreconcilably separating herselfe from the true Catholick Church, and the true visible branches thereof, is a true visible Church of Christ.

But the Church of Rome is obstinately schismatall, damnable hereticall and Apostatall, vnreconcilably separating herselfe from the true Catholick Church, and the true visible branches thereof.

Therefore the Church of Rome is no true visible Church of Christ.

Yet one more, for M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley and M<sup>r</sup> Butterfield to ruminate vpon.

Either the Church of Rome is no true visible Church of Christ, or else the Church of England must needes be no true visible Church of Christ.

But the Church of England is a true visible Church of Christ.

Therefore the Church of Rome is no true visible Church of Christ.

The Assumption I hope they will not deny. If they deny the Proposition, I proue it: Things of different definitions haue different denominations: but the Church of England and that of Rome, are of different definitions, as concerning a true visible Church: therefore both of them cannot bee true visible Churches; but if the one bee true, the other is false. Now that which demonstrates and denominates the Church of England to bee a true visible Church, doth *ipso facto* exclude and deny the Church of Rome to bee a true visible Church, as wee haue proued before by the proper markes of a true visible Church. On the other side, that which the Church of Rome brings to shew herselfe to bee the true visible Church, if it bee true shew saith, doth necessarily exclude the Church of England from being a true visible Church. For the visibility of the

church of Rome consists in an vniōn betweene that church and her vīsible Head the Pope, vnto whom they must bee subject vnder paine of damnation. But this vīsibility of a true Church, the Church of England disclaimeth. The Church of England then, and the Church of Rome, standing in opposite termes touching the definition of a true vīsible Church, cannot both of them bee a true vīsible church of Christ. Vpon this reason the church of Rome denies the church of England to bee a true vīsible church, but false and hereticall, and wherein saluation is not to bee found, because it is without the verge, forsooth, of the Roman catholike church. And what reason then hath any Minister of the church of England, of what ranke soever, to acknowledge the church of Rome for a true vīsible church of Christ? Doth hee not by a necessary consequence conclude, that the church of England is no true vīsible church of Christ? For these two, as contradicōries, expell each other: for wherein the church of England shewes herselfe to bee a true vīsible church of Christ, shee therein denies the church of Rome to bee a true vīsible church of Christ: and wherein the church of Rome vants herselfe to bee the true catholike vīsible Church, shee therein shuts out the Church of England as hereticall and schisimaticall, as hauing no communion with the catholike church. And yet shall we say, that, *wee detest not to hold communion with the Church of Rome?* Fye for shame, that wee should bee so base to scrape acquaintance with that beldame Babylonian whore, when her bold face, and insolent forehead stickes not to brand vs for forlorne heretickes, shut out from saluation, till wee returne to the Antichristian yoake againe. No maruiale then, if recusants flap our Ministers in the mouth with this, that the best in our Church confesseth theirs a true church, and saluation there to bee found: but wee (say they) do not acknowledge you a true church, w herein saluation

vation is to be found, therefore we are vpon a sure ground. This was objected to one of our Ministers of late by a great Recusant. And are wee not well enough serued? For if we will needes call the whore Christs Spoule: why should she not requite vs, by calling our Mother a whore? But here an end.

*Vive, vale: si quid novisti rectius istis,  
Candidus imperi: si non, his utere mecum:*

*Liue, blest: if ought more right then thele you see.  
Kindly impart: if not, take part with mee.*

*1. Kings 18. 21.*

*If the Lord bee God, follow hime: but if Baal bee  
hee, or if Babel be shee, then  
goe after them.*

To God only be glory. Amen.

FINIS.



which is to be done, and the time is about the 15th of October, and  
it is now necessary to make our arrangements for the day  
and the meetings. At the same time we may be obliged to have  
our 11th meeting on Saturday, October 28th, and the 12th on  
Sunday the 29th, as we are likely to be engaged on Monday and  
Tuesday in the election of a new Bishop of Cork.

## Concerning the Church of England of Engli

# Errata in the Epistle to the Bishop of Exon.

Page 1, line 18, for the more, reade phrase, l, 27, r, in Peter, 6, page 2, l, 20, read Lord-ship. *In fine*, l, 24, blot out of their, line 25, r, my speare.

## In the Epistle to H. Cholmley.

Page 4, l, 1, r, *deposita* and *quarumque*, l, 4, r, *one side*, l, 24, r, *hazard*, p, 5, l, 28, r, *tremble*, and *reperunt*.

## To the Reader.

Page 1, l, 27, reade my hap.

## In the booke.

For Cholinley, reade Cholmley, page 4, l, 10, for leane, r, leaue, p, 6, l, 16, r, bring in p, 8, l, 1, r, with thec, l, 14, r, *recipientes*, l, 17, r, to euery, p, 10, l, 11, r, spunged, p, 14, l, 6, r, quarel me, p, 15, l, 11, r, to be accidéral, l, 36, r, extent, p, 16, l, 12, r, successiue-ly it may, p, 20, l, 8, r, layd fellony, l, 10, r, alledgedh, p, 21, l, 17, r, part, p, 23, l, 13, r, neuer accursed, p, 24, l, 14, r, our Church condemnes, p, 26, l, 24, r, accursed by, p, 30, l, 22, r, then reply p, 35, in the marg, r, *Necol*, p, 36, l, 11, r, to prate the like, p, 39, l, 28, r, then of the honour, p, 41, l, 3, r, for marks of, p, 44, l, 6, r, Intention, page 47, line 12, reade wherein if I must, page 48, line 16, reade know and loue the truth, p, 52, l, 34, reade one of, p, 56, l, 1, reade in a weake, page 57, line 2, reade at your perill, l, 28, r, put this quest, l, 31, r, dying a Papist, p, 55, l, 10, r, about him, p, 61, l, 25, r, contemne, p, 63, l, 28, r, for, the Massie, r, *Hiemals*, p, 64, l, 13, r, shall, if not reape more profit, p, 67, l, 19, r, warnes vs, p, 74, l, r, Thus then, p, 79, l, 7, r, my Mother, l, 25, r, of visibility, p, 80, l, 10, r, which was the signe, l, 7, r, and yet she, p, 81, l, 6, r, isbut the bare, l, 27, r, Nor can you, p, 83, l, 19, 20, reade as one liue, to wit, boldnesse (Mr. Burton) p, 84, r, l, 14, *phum canis*, p, 85, l, 6, r, *scennum- dum mensuram*, p, 87, l, 19, r, he sets downe, l, 31, r, for taking, p, 90, l, 10, r, each simple l, 18, r, not infused, l, 25, r, *Pontifician*, p, 96, l, r, Councel of Trent, p, 99, l, 8, confessed eu'en, l, 23, r, *is*, p, 104, l, 15, r, and deny, p, 107, l, 18, r, The cleansing, l, 19, r, In the, l, 36, r, and authentike, p, 108, l, 1, blot out all, but, Nor, l, 32, r, Apo- staticall, p, 109, l, 32, r, who are made, p, 110, l, 18, r, past all peraduen. p, 131, l, 41, r, denying them to be meant, p, 114, l, 16, r, those Churches, p, 115, l, 24, r, had re- served, l, 27, in the marg. put obiection 4, p, 116, l, 20, r, vnderstanding it, p, 117, l, 10, r, true v:isible, p, 121, l, 19, r, your zeale, l, 23, r, certified and satisfied, p, 122, l, 14, r, Sacraments, page 125 l, 15, r, is it.